BHAVABHŪTI

Extension Lectures Publications Series—5

BHAVABHUTI

BY

R. D. KARMARKAR

(Ex-Principal, Sir Parashurambhau College, Poona.
Ex-Director, Post-Graduate and Research Department,
Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona)

KARNATAK UNIVERSITY, DHARWAR

1971

Publisher

S. S. Wodeyar, M A, LL. B
Registrar, Karnatak University
Dharwar-3 (India)

First Published September 1963
Copies · 1000

Reprint November 1971
Copies 2000

Price **Half Cal. Rs 6-00, $ 2-00; or Sh. 14**
Ord. Rs. 4-00; $ 1-50; or Sh. 10

Printer ·

B. S. Sadhani
Shivashankar Printing House
Near Hebballi Agashi, Dharwar-1

FOREWORD

There is a growing need for reliable and readable accounts of our classical Sanskrit writers, since most of the available books are either too scholarly and academic or too popular and sentimental. Prof. Karmarkar's "Extension Lectures on Kālidāsa", published by the Karnatak University in a book-form, has been well received by the press and the public alike, and I am happy that a companion volume is being brought out now on Bhavabhūti, whose claim on our regard is almost on a par with that of Kālidāsa

I cannot think of anyone more qualified than Prof Karmarkar to undertake the task of interpreting our classical masters; and I am sure that his able presentation which is neither a rhapsody of praise nor a carping *critique*, will provide an interesting insight into the art and achievement of Bhavabhūti, the playwright. The professor is a master of his material and moves without effort or pedantry from point to point He furnishes an account capable of meeting the needs of the mature student and of appeal to cultivated readers generally. I expect it will send readers back to the Sanskrit works with renewed interest and deeper understanding. I earnestly hope that this 'Extension Lectures Series' will prove useful and stimulating

Dharwar,
16th Sept 1963

D C PAVATE
Vice-Chancellor

PREFACE

I delivered four lectures on Bhavabhūti, at the invitation of the Karnatak University, two on each day, on 29th and 30th September 1961 at Dharwar. Dr. S C. Nandimath presided on the first day and the Vice-Chancellor, Shri D. C. Pavate presided on the second day. There was a good appreciative audience which consisted mostly of University teachers, students and educationalists from the Karnatak. These lectures are published now in a book-form by the Karnatak University.

The lectures were on the same pattern as was followed in the case of lectures on Kālidāsa delivered by me at Dharwar in 1959

Fortunately, there is not much of a controversy about the date and works of Bhavabhūti. The available material on the various views about Bhavabhūti has been briefly summarised and I have given my own appreciation of Bhavabhūti and his works as best as I could.

The Appendices give a number of well-known passages from the three plays of Bhavabhūti, with translation into English, an index of important names and topics etc.; a rough map of India indicating the various regions and places referred to by Bhavabhūti, has also been added.

I hope that this book would give to the reader a fairly good idea of Bhavabhūti as a great Sanskrit poet.

Dr Pusalker and Prof. Bedekar of the Bhandarkar O R. Institute made valuable suggestions, so also Dr. K Krishnamoorthy (Head of the Sanskrit Department, Karnatak University) and his colleagues I thank them all for their great interest in this publication

Miss Vimal Thakar, M A , Government of India Fellow at the Bhandarkar Institute has all along been helping me in this matter, for which I feel grateful to her

The Managers of the Āryabhūṣaṇa Press have as usual, carried out the task of printing the book efficiently, and deserve my best thanks In this connection, I would like to make a special mention of Shri Y E. Dhayagude, the Head Proof-corrector at the Āryabhūsana Press, who has developed a remarkable acumen for spotting out printing errors, with his expert knowledge extending over thirty years

28 August 1963
Bhandarkar Oriental
Research Institute
Poona

R D KARMARKAR

CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS USED

Kumāra—Kumārasambhava
Mahāvīra—Mahāvīracarita
Mālavikā—Mālavikāgnimitra
Mālatī—Mālatīmādhava
Megha—Meghadūta
Raghu—Raghuvaṁśa
Śāk—Śākuntala
Uttara—Uttararāmacarita
Vikrama—Vikramorvaśīya.
(II. 2—Verse No. 2, in Act or Sarga II).
(II 2–1–Line 1, after verse 2 in Act or Sarga II.)

SRĪ

BHAVABHUTI

LECTURE I

BHAVABHUTI : His Date, Life, Works

There would be general agreement among Sanskritists that Bhavabhūti is an outstanding Sanskrit dramatist and a good exponent of ancient Indian Culture, and his rank would be just below Kālidāsa whose position as Kavikulaguru has remained unchallenged throughout the ages

(A) Bhavabhūti's Date

The question of Bhavabhūti's date fortunately presents no serious difficulty.

Kalhana's *Rājataranginī*[1] mentions King Yaśovarman as the patron of Bhavabhūti along with Vākpatirāja, the author of the Prakrit poem *Gaudavaho* which describes the victory of Yaśovarman over a Gauda king Vākpatirāja speaks of Bhavabhūti in eulogistic terms[2] in his work. According to Kalhana, Yaśovarman was defeated by Lalitāditya or Muktāpīda who reigned about 700 A D to 735 A. D. (731 A. D — 767 A. D. according to Chinese chronology) Chinese sources tell us that a King I-cha-fan-mo (identified with Yaśovarman) had sent an ambassador to China in

---

1 कविवाक्पतिराजश्रीभवभूत्यादिसेविता ।
जितो ययौ यशोवर्मा तद्गुणस्तुतिवन्दिताम्।। IV 144.

2. [भवभूतिजलधिनिर्गतकाव्यामृतरसकणा इव स्फुरन्ति ।
यस्य विशेषा अद्यापि विकटेषु कथानिवेशेषु ।।] Verse 799

730 A. D Yaśovarman's successor Āmarāja is said to have been converted to Jainism by one Bappabhaṭṭi, according to the Jaina Rājaśekhara between 751 A. D. and 755 A D Yaśovarman, therefore, must have died before 750 A D. Bhavabhūti thus could be safely stated to have lived about the first quarter of the 8th century

This is also confirmed by the fact that Vāmana (about 800 A D) quotes from Bhavabhūti[3] in his *Kāvyālaṃkārasūtravṛtti*

Bāṇa (about 625 A D) who refers to a number of his predecessors[4] by name, does not mention Bhavabhūti, presumably because Bhavabhūti did not live before his time (the non-mention argument is generally regarded as a weak one, but Bāṇa could not possibly have overlooked so great a poet as Bhavabhūti if he had been his predecessor)

That Bhavabhūti is later than Kālidāsa whom he imitates deliberately, is self-evident.

(B) Bhavabhūti's Life

Bhavabhūti, unlike Sanskrit writers in general, has given in the Prastāvanās of his three dramas, a fairly detailed account about himself and his family. The account in the *Uttara*[5] is the scantiest, that in the

---

3 इय गेहे लक्ष्मी. (*Uttara* I-38).
पक्ष्मालीपिङ्गलिम्न (*Mālatī*, Nāndī verse 4).

4 Bhāsa, Guṇādhya, Kālidāsa, Ādhyarāja etc (*Harṣacarita*, Introductory verses)

5 अस्ति तत्रभवान् काश्यप श्रीकण्ठपदलाञ्छन पदवाक्यप्रमाणज्ञो भवभूतिर्नाम।

Mahāvīra[6] the most detailed, while in the *Mālatī*,[7] a few details are omitted, but some more are introduced We accordingly learn that

(a) Bhavabhūti was descended from a family of very learned and holy sacrificers, of Kāśyapa *Gotra*, belonging to the Taittirīyaśākhā of Krsna Yajurveda, and having the surname Udumbara,

(b) his genealogical table is as follows —

1 महाकवि—performed the Vājapeya sacrifice
2 — Unknown
3 — Unknown
4 — भट्टगोपाल
5 — नीलकण्ठ married Jātūkarnī
6 — भवभूति

The name of the Preceptor is ज्ञाननिधि, significantly so called, who was a Paramahamsa.

6 अस्ति दक्षिणापथे पद्मपुर नाम नगरम्। तत्र केचित् तैत्तिरीयिण काश्यपाश्चरणगुरव पङ्क्तिपावना पञ्चाग्नयो धृतव्रता सोमपीथिन उदुम्बरनामानो ब्रह्मवादिन प्रतिवसन्ति। तदामुष्यायणस्य तत्रभवतो वाजपेययाजिनो महाकवे पञ्चम सुगृहीतनाम्नो भट्टगोपालस्य पौत्र पवित्रकीर्तेर्नीलकण्ठस्यात्मसभव श्रीकण्ठपदलाञ्छनो भवभूतिर्नाम जातूकर्णीपुत्र कविर्मित्रधेयमित्यत्रभवन्तो विदाकुर्वन्तु ।

श्रेष्ठ परमहसाना महर्षीणामिवाङ्गिरा ।
यथार्थनामा भगवान् यस्य ज्ञाननिधिर्गुरु ।।

7 In the *Mālatī*, there is no mention of महाकवि and ज्ञाननिधि, but विदर्भेषु पद्मनगर is read for पद्मपुर and an additional verse is given—

ते श्रोत्रियास्तत्त्वविनिश्चयाय भूरि श्रुत शाश्वतमाद्रियन्ते ।
इष्टाय पूताय च कर्मणेऽर्थान् दारानपत्याय तपोर्थमायु ।।

It would be seen that though the passages in the Introduction to the dramas, are long enough, they tell us precious little about Bhavabhūti himself. The elaborate description of his ancestors in glowing terms has hardly any appeal to the modern reader.

(C) The Poet's Name

There should really have been no controversy about the personal name of the poet, in the face of the expression भवभूतिर्नाम which occurs in all the three Prastāvanās to the plays. But the commentators Vīrarāghava, Jagaddhara, Tripurāri and Anantapandita (who are not earlier than the 15th century) try to show off their ingenuity by relying upon the expression (भट्ट) श्रीकण्ठपदलाञ्छन — and the different ways of explaining the term भवभूति

Vīrarāghava—Srīkantha was the personal name

(पितृकृतनामेदम्),

Bhavabhūti was the appellation given to the poet by the king who was pleased with the verse

साम्बा पुनातु भवभूतिपवित्रमूर्ति ।

Jagaddhara— नाम्ना श्रीकण्ठ, प्रसिद्ध्या भवभूतिरित्यर्थ ।

Tripurāri— भवभूतिरिति व्यवहारे तस्यैव नामान्तरम् (Thus all the above three commentators take श्रीकण्ठ as the proper or personal name.)

Anantapaṇdita says that the appellation Bhavabhūti was due to the verse

गिरिजाया कुचौ वन्दे भवभूतिसिताननौ ।

भवभूति is also explained as भवात् भूति यस्य स (who owed his prosperity to Siva).

The fact that the commentators give different interpretations of the word Bhavabhūti and that the

word Lāñchana (in श्रीकण्ठपदलाञ्छन) means 'a characteristic' show that in the eyes of the commentators, the expression 'Bhavabhūti' is more important, and is more likely to be the personal name of the poet

The expression उदुम्बर-(डम्बर as read by Jagaddhara) नामान shows that उदुम्बर was the surname (as the ancestors are so described) or family name because the family lived in the town Udumbara. To take the name of the town as the surname is a characteristic of the Karnatak people (the Maharashtra people add the affix 'Kara' to the name of the town, so Udumbarakara would be according to them the proper form) So Bhavabhūti can be described as Udumbara Bhavabhūti Nīlakantha (with the surname first according to the modern style), abbreviated as B N Udumbara

(D) Place of Birth or Original Abode

Bhavabhūti mentions Padmapura (or, Padmanagara) as the abode of his family, in the Deccan or Daksiṇāpatha[8]. In some Mss of the *Mālatīmādhava*, the expression विदर्भेषु actually occurs. Padmapura is identified by some with Padmāvatī (modern Padama Pavāyā, about fourty miles from Gwalior), which is described in detail by the poet in his *Mālatīmādhava* (Act IX). But there is no evidence to show that the Vidarbha had its boundary extended so far to the north, and the detailed description of Padmāvatī given by the poet can be attributed to his stay there for a long time

8. नर्मदाया दक्षिणेन देशो दक्षिणापथ । (Yaśodhara in his commentary on Vātsyāyana's *Kāmasūtra*)
माहिष्मत्या परतो दक्षिणापथ । (Rājaśekhara in his *Kāvyamīmāmsā*).

M. M. Mirashi[9] has, we think, conclusively proved the indentification of Bhavabhūti's Padmapura with a village of that name in the Bhandārā district in Vidarbha

(E) Kālapriyanātha

All the three dramas were represented on the stage at the Yātrā festivities in honour of Kālapriyanātha. Shri Lele understood by Kālapriyā to be the modern Kālpī, but this view has not found favour with scholars, so also the view that the expression refers to Mahākāla of Ujjayinī. M M Mirashi, on the strength of the verse कल्याणाना त्वमसि[10] etc., holds that Kālapriyānātha refers to the Sun, a big temple in honour of whom is mentioned in the Purānas, situated south of the Yamunā in the centre of Āryāvarta (also at Multan in the West, and at Konārka in Orissa)[11] and that Bhavabhūti was apparently a devotee of the Sun Against this it might be argued that though the prayer to the Sun (कल्याणाना त्वमसि) breathes intense religious fervour, it in no way can be a convincing argument that Bhavabhūti was devoted to the Sun An equally beautiful prayer to the Moon is found in *Vikram*[12] by Kālidāsa, but that cannot prove that Kālidāsa was a devotee of the Moon.

We are of opinion that Bhavabhūti's Kālapriyānātha is the Svayambhū (not constructed by any human agency) Śivalinga known as Suvarnabindu

9 *Saṁśodhanamuktāvali* (in Marathi).

10. *Mālatīmādhava* I-3

11. *Saṁśodhanamuktāvali*, Sara III.

12. Act III 7 रविमाविशते सता क्रियायै सुधया तर्पयते सुरान्पितृश्च ।
तमसा निशि मूर्च्छता निहन्त्रे हरचूडानिहितात्मने नमस्ते ॥

(described in *Mālatī* Act IX — as मधुमतीसिन्धुसभेदपावनो भगवान्भवानीपतिरपौरुषेयप्रतिष्ठ सुवर्णबिन्दुरित्याख्यायते) at the confluence of the Madhumatī and the Sindhu rivers Bhavabhtūi deliberately uses the roundabout expression Bhavānīpati, to correspond to Kālapriyā (Bhavānī) nātha.

(F) Bhavabhuti and Umbeka (Umveka, Uvveyaka) Identical

The following facts about Umbeka are well-established—

(1) Umbeka wrote a commentary on the *Ślokavārtika* of Kumārila, his comments on the first verse of the *Śloka* are .—

अत एव वार्तिककारैर्विशुद्धज्ञानदेहायेत्यादिना ग्रन्थादौ महादेवो नमस्कृत ।

(2) Umbeka also wrote a commentary on the *Bhāvanāviveka* of Mandanamiśra, wherein he quotes the Kārikā, अन्यदेव हि धात्वर्थसामान्यकरणात्मकम् । अन्यच्च भावना नाम साध्यत्वेन व्यवस्थितम् ॥ as that of his Guru and Bhaṭṭapāda

This shows that Kumārila Bhatta was the Guru of Umbeka

(3) Kamalaśīla in his commentary on the *Tattva-samgraha*[13] quotes Uvveyaka as a writer of Mīmāmsā (It appears that Uvveyaka is just a variant for Umbeka).

Now—

In a very old manuscript[14] of the *Mālatī*, the colophons occur —

इति श्रीभट्टकुमारिलशिष्यकृते मालतीमाधवे तृतीयोऽङ्क ,

इति श्रीकुमारिलस्वामीप्रसादप्राप्तवाग्वैभवश्रीमदुम्बेकाचार्यविरचिते मालती-माधवे षष्ठोऽङ्क ।

It is true that only one manuscript so far is known to support the above, but there is no reason to suppose that the writer wrote this out of his own brain.

Again,

---

13 Gaekwad's Oriental Series

14 S P Pandit first made this known

Citsukhācārya in his *Tattvapradīpikā* writes —

तस्माच्छास्त्र शब्दविज्ञानादसन्निकृष्टे बुद्धिरिति लक्षणमलक्षणम्। तथा, आप्तवाक्य शब्दप्रमाणमिति नैयायिकानामपि—

आप्तोदीरितवाक्येषु <u>मालतीमाधवादिषु</u>।
व्यभिचारान्न तद्युक्तमाप्तत्वस्यानिरुक्तित ॥

स्वकपोलकल्पितमालतीमाधवादिवाक्येषु प्रामाण्याभावादतिव्याप्ति। न हि पुरा, आप्त एव सन्, नाटकनाटिकादिप्रबन्धविरचनमात्रेणानाप्तो भवति भवभूति। उक्त चैत-दुम्बेकेन-यदाप्तोऽपि कस्मैचिदुपदिशति न त्वयाननुभूतार्थविषय वाक्य प्रयोक्तव्यम्। यथा, अङ्गुल्यग्रे हस्तियूथशतमास्ते, इति। तत्रार्थव्यभिचार स्फुट।

It appears from the above that Citsukha regards Bhavabhūti and Umbeka as identical M M Mirashi does not agree to this, on the ground that if Citsukha held that view, he would have written उक्त च तेनैव and not उक्त चैतदुम्बेकेन, but surely चैतत् is sufficiently forcible to suggest the same thing as तेनैव

Umbeka, at the begining of his *Tātparyaṭīkā* on *Ślokavārtika* has the verse—

ये नाम केचिदिह न प्रथयन्त्यवज्ञा
जानन्ति ते किमपि तान्प्रति नैष यत्न।
उत्पत्स्यतेऽस्ति मम कोऽपि समानधर्मा
कालो ह्यय निरवधिर्विपुला च पृथ्वी ॥

(The verse occurs in the *Mālatīmādhava* Act I) We regard this evidence as more or less conclusive to prove that Bhavabhūti and Umbeka are one—

(1) It is admitted that Umbeka was a very proud man, he was not afraid to criticise Śabara and Kumārilabhatta, his own teacher (probably in some Mss. यथोक्त गुरुणा is found, as referring to Kumārila), and justifies his conduct by quoting from the *Mahābhārata* the verse—

गुरोरप्यवलिप्तस्य कार्याकार्यमजानत।
उत्पथप्रतिपन्नस्य परित्यागो विधीयते ॥

(2) It is not unusual for writers to make use of well-known verses of authors of established repute, for their own purpose, but it is well-nigh impossible to believe that Umbeka, proud and self-willed that he was, would have condescended to make use of a verse of a contemporary writer.

(3) Umbeka's date is generally accepted as being about the eighth century

(4) The chances are therefore that Bhvabhūti and Umbeka are identical, even if we do not accept Bhavabhūti to be a pupil of Kumārilabhatta[15].

(G) Family Life

As in the case of Kālidāsa, nothing is known about Bhavabhūti's marriage, wife, children etc From the description of family life as a whole, found in the three dramas, it may be surmised that the poet must have enjoyed a happy domestic life, blessed with children, for a pretty long time Bhavabhūti attaches great importance to the sanctity of family ties and to the proper observance of the rites ordained by the Śāstras.

(H) Bhavabhūti's Works

The three dramas, *Mahāvīracarita*, *Mālatīmādhava* and *Uttararāmacarita* are undoubtedly the compositions

---

15 It is not right to expect in a drama frequent references to philosophical matters, but there is a sufficient number of references to the Karmakānda in the dramas of Bhavabhūti, to show that he was very well acquainted with the Pūrvamīmāmsā, and could have Kumārila as his teacher

of Bhavabhūti. From the quotation from Citsukha's commentary given above (नाटकनाटिकादिप्रबन्धविरचनमात्रेण) it can be surmised that Bhavabhūti must have written some *Nāṭikās* and *Prabandhas* also A large number of verses [16] ascribed to Bhavabhūti, but not found in his three dramas, are to be found in the various anthologies This also shows that Bhavabhūti was a prolific writer What works are to be understood by the expression Prabandha above, can not be ascertained. It is not improbable that the poet might have written some philosophical works bearing on the Mīmāmsā also.

16 See Appendix II

LECTURE II
DRAMAS OF BHAVABHŪTI

Of the three dramas written by Bhavabhūti, two viz *Mahāvīracarita* and *Uttararāmacarita* deal with the story of Rāma, while the third *Mālatīmādhava* has more or less an original plot containing many an *Adbhuta* incident

Mahāvīracarita[17]
(A) The Plot—

This drama is in five Acts (in an incomplete form). The plot is as follows —

Act I—Viśvāmitra wanted to perform a sacrifice at his Āśrama on the Kauśāmbī river, he had gone to Daśaratha to seek his help to protect the sacrifice from the Rākṣasas, and had brought Rāma and Lakṣmana with him to help him At the same time Janaka of Mithilā was also engaged in a sacrifice, so he sent his brother Kuśadhvaja, along with Sītā (his own daughter) and Urmilā (his borther's daughter) to attend Viśvāmitra's sacrifice Kuśadhvaja was struck at the august appearance of Rāma and thought that Rāma would be an ideal husband for Sītā (but as Janaka had already declared that Sītā would be given in marriage to one who would break the bow of Śiva, Kuśadhvaja did not think that Rāma was capable of breaking the bow and so Rāma's marriage with Sītā appeared to him as an ideal dream). Ahalyā was freed from her curse by Rāma.

In the meanwhile, an envoy from Rāvaṇa comes there to demand Sītā's hand in marriage for Rāvana

---

17 Often abbreviated as *Vīracarita.*

(the envoy had first gone to Janaka who asked him to see Kuśadhvaja at Viśāvmitra's sacrifice) Viśvāmitra told the envoy that the matter rested with Janaka. The Rāksasī Tādakā makes her appearance just then and Rāma kills her; Viśvāmitra presents the Jṛmbhaka missiles to Rāma, manages to bring the bow of Śiva there by his Yogic power and Rāma breaks the bow (All this takes place in the presence of the envoy of Rāvana) Viśvāmitra then arranges for the marriage of Rāma with Sītā, and of Laksmana, Bharata and Śatrughna, with the three daughters of Kuśadhvaja,— Urmila, Māndavī and Śrutakīrti. Daśaratha was invited to Mithilā where the ceremonies were to be performed after the sacrifice was over

The demons, Subāhu and Mārīca who arrive there are killed by Rāma

Act II—Mālyavat, Rāvaṇa's minister has been very uneasy at the report of the envoy about the happenings at the Siddhāśrama of Viśvāmitra. Śūrpanakhā (Mālyavat's grand-daughter and Rāvana's sister) reports about the marriages of the four brothers Rāma etc., and the gift of Indra's bow to Rāma by Agastya. Just then comes a courier from Paraśurāma with a letter wherein Paraśurāma expresses his great concern with the tidings of molestation of the sages in the Dandakāranya by the Rāksasas.

Mālyavat conceives the scheme of inciting Paraśurāma (who was a devotee of Śiva) against Rāma who had insulted Śiva by breaking his bow, so that both Rāma and Paraśurāma may destroy each other,or one of them was bound to be knocked out, in any case the result would be favourable to Rāvaṇa. Accordingly,

Mālyavat goes to Mahendradvīpa, the abode of Paraśurāma and persuades him to attack Rāma.

Paraśurāma meets Rāma, has real admiration for him, but cannot forget the fact that Rāma was a Ksatriya and so, deserved to be killed (as he had vowed to make the earth bereft of Ksatriyas). King Janaka and his Purohita Śatānanda (who hurls abusive epithets at Paraśurāma) try to pacify Paraśurāma, but in vain. Rāma is called for the Kankanamocana ceremony by the mothers-in-law.

Act III—Vasistha and Viśvāmitra try their best to appease Paraśurāma Daśaratha also becomes angry and is ready to fight with him. Rāma arrives on the scene and vows to control Paraśurāma

Act IV–Paraśurāma is defeated Mālyavat asks Śūrpanakhā to assume the form of Mantharā, the maid to Kaikeyī (the favourite wife of Daśaratha) and make Kaikeyī ask for the two boons promised to her by Daśaratha- by one boon, Bharata was to be the King and by the second, Rāma was to go into exile for fourteen years.

Rāma goes into exile into the forest along with Sītā and Lakṣmana, and Bharata remains at Nandigrāma to administer the kingdom in the name of Rāma who had given his golden *Pādukās* (foot-wear) to Bharata.

Act V–Rāvana carries off Sītā. Rama and Lakṣmana meet Jaṭāyus who tells them about Sītā's capture, they proceed to Kiṣkindhā (Virādha is killed on the way) and make friends with Sugrīva. Rāma kills Vālin.

(B) Sources of the Mahāvīracarita

There are so many versions of the Rāma-kathā, both Indian and Foreign (Asiatic) that it is impossible

to state definitely what versions were current before Bhavabhūti's time, and which of them Bhavabhūti could have probably consulted—

The following facts are, however, sufficiently clear :—

(1) Bhavabhūti was a great admirer of Vālmīki whom he calls Vaśyavāk (Master of speech), and of the *Rāmāyaṇa*.

(2) He also was sufficiently acquainted with Kālidāsa's *Raghuvaṃśa*

(3) He possibly knew the different versions of the Rāma-story in the *Mahābhārata*

Bhavabhūti, however, considered himself free to transform the Rāma-story to any extent, if he considered it fit to do so, from the point of view of dramatic exigency. His main object in writing this play, is, as he himself tells us,[18] to depict the Heroic sentiment in all its varieties in the case of extraordinary persons. Thus, to show Rāma as a Mahāvīra, Bhavabhūti describes the following episodes as happening at the Siddhāśrama itself—

(1) Ahalyā freed from the curse

(2) The killing of Tādakā, daughter of Suketu and wife of Sunda (Rāma has no hesitation in killing her as directed by Viśvāmitra).

(3) Viśvamitra gives the Jrmbhaka missiles to Rāma.

(4) Viśvāmitra manages by his Yogic power to bring the bow of Śiva to his Āśrama, and Rāma easily breaks it into twain.

---

18. अप्राकृतेषु पात्रेषु यत्र वीर स्थितो रस ।
भेदै सूक्ष्मैरभिव्यक्तै प्रत्याधार विभज्यते ।। (*Mahāvīra* I-3.)

(5) Kuśadhvaja there and then offers his niece Sītā to Rāma, now that he had broken the bow (which was the condition to be fulfilled by one aspiring for Sītā's hand)

The marriages of the other three sons of Daśaratha are also decided upon by Viśvāmitra (Lakṣmana—Urmilā, Bharata—Māṇḍavī, and Śatrughna—Śrutakīrti)

He has made the following changes in the generally accepted Rāma-story in his play—

(a) The introduction of the scheming Mālyavat, and Rāvaṇa's envoy to ask for Sītā's hand in marriage; so also, (b) the episode of Śūrpaṇakhā disguising herself as Mantharā and securing the two boons from Daśaratha; and the departure of Rāma to the forest immediately after the marriage-ceremony is over, (c) the inciting of Paraśurāma to avenge the insult to Śiva by Rāma in breaking Śiva's bow, (d) Paraśurāma's arrival at Mithilā when the marriage ceremonies were in full swing and his fight with Rāma there, (e) Rāma killing Vālin in a fair fight--all these are departures from the story as given by Vālmīki

The meeting of Rāma and Lakṣmana with Sītā and Urmilā at the Siddhāśrama is introduced, presumably with a view to describe love at first sight.

The general impression is, therefore, that Bhavabhūti does not owe much to the Rāmāyana-versions before him, and that he gives a new orientation to the Rāmāyana-story, according to his own ideas.

(C) The Extent of the Mahavīracarita

Vīrarāghava, a commentator on the *Mahāvīra* regards the *Mahāvīracarita* (up to V. 46) as the work of

Bhavabhūti, and he comments on the remaining portion (V. 46 to end of Act VII) which he expressly mentions as the work of one Subrahmanya who lived about the Seventeenth century. It is recorded in a manuscript in the Tanjore Library, that Rājaśekhara destroyed[19] the portion of the play beyond V 46. The Nirnayasāgara edition contains the portion attributed to Subrahmanya, with Vīrarāghava's commentary. That edition also publishes another version under the heading श्रीभवभूतिकविप्रणीतमहावीरचरितस्य सर्वत्र प्रचलित पाठ This version is generally accepted as the one probably written by Bhavabhūti. (According to some, one Vināyaka is responsible for this).

[The following is a brief summary of the added portion]

Act V—(Remaining portion) Rāma and Vālin fight, both calling each other Vīra Vālin is wounded. Vālin enjoins Sugrīva to make friends with Rāma. Vālin throws himself from a precipice and ends his life.

Act VI— Mālyavat hears about the burning of Lankā by Hanūmat. Rāvana treats Angada who has come as an envoy from Rāma, with contempt Indra places his war-chariot at the disposal of Rāma in his fight with Rāvana. Rāvana is killed by Rāma. Laksmana also performs feats of valour.

Act VII-After Rāvana's death, Bibhīsana is installed as the Ruler of Lankā. The gods and others congratulate Sītā on her successful emergence from the fire-ordeal Rāma along with Sītā, Laksmana, Sugrīva and Bibhīsana travels in the Puspaka aerial car to reach

---

19. श्रीवश्यवाचा भवभूतिमहाकविना विरचित महावीरचरित नाम नाटकमेता-
वदेवास्मिन् देशे दृश्यते, शेष तु राजशेखरेण दग्धमिति प्रसिद्धि ।
(Krishnamachariar, History of Classical Sanskrit Literature P 622, foot-note 9)

Ayodhyā On hearing from Hanūmat, of Rāma's imminent arrival, Bharata with his army proceeds to greet Rāma Vasistha, Arundhatī and Daśaratha's wives also greet the party. Arundhatī consoles Kaikeyī, assuring her that she was in no way responsible for Rāma's exile (as Śūrpanakhā had taken the form of Mantharā, Kaikeyī's maid) Viśvāmitra also arrives with his pupils, and Rāma is duly crowned]

(D) The Title Mahāvīracarita[20].

महावीरचरितम् is usually explained as महावीरस्य चरित वर्ण्यते यत्र तत् नाटकम्

Or

महावीराणा चरितानि वर्ण्यन्ते यत्र तत्

Or

महावीरस्य (महावीराणा) चरितम् (चरितानि), then by resorting to the विशेषणविशेष्यभाव, a composition dealing with the deeds of Mahāvīras

That Rāma is the Mahāvīra is obvious and the drama therefore deals at great length with the wonderful heroic deeds performed by Rāma up to his coronation at Ayodhyā, on his return from exile after the killing of Rāvana One would have expected the title to be Pūrva-Rāmacarita to correspond to the poet's play *Uttararāmacarita* which describes the history of Rāma, from his coronation onwards, if Rāma alone had been described as a Mahāvīra in the play. It is true that about ten heroic deeds connected with Rāma have been described by the poet as 'wonderful' (Adbhuta or Āścarya), but it must at the same time

20. See *Annals* (B O. R. Institute) Vol XXXVIII, 1958, Pp 148–153 where the same topic is dealt with in detail, by R D Karmarkar.

be taken into consideration that Rāma is not even once[21] called Mahāvīra. Bhavabhūti makes it quite clear in I. 3, that he wants to describe the heroic sentiment in all its subtle aspects as found in different persons (pratyādhāram), and he has undoubtedly succeeded in doing this in the play. Thus—

(1) **Paraśurama**—He is actually called Mahāvīra (IV. 19) by Janaka and a number of his extraordinary (lokottara) valorous deeds are referred to in the play, such as— the extermination of the Ksatriya race twenty-one times, the defeat of Kārtikeya, the fight with Śiva, the gift of the whole earth to the Brāhmanas Rāma also pays a great compliment to Paraśurāma by calling him त्रिभुवनैकवीरो मुनि, the one warrior in all the three worlds and a sage to boot, and प्रचण्ड इव पिण्डतामुपगतश्च वीरो रस (IV. 23), the terrible heroic sentiment in a mass.

(2) **Vālin**—As stated already, he is actually called Mahāvīra, and his outstanding qualities such as magnanimity, loyalty, courage, frankness etc., are emphasised.

(3) **Rāvaṇa**—Both Rāma (V. 35) and Citraratha (VI. p. 216) call him Mahāvīra; various extra-ordinary feats of his are also mentioned, such as imprisonment of the gods, cutting down his own head to propitiate Śiva, the lifting up of the Kailāsa mountain etc.

(4) **Hanūmat**—Laksmana says (V 31) about him, हनूमान् हनूमानिति महानय वीरवाद, and his valour is described as equal to that of Indra, Vāyu and Vālin.

---

21 Vālin calls Rāma Mahāvīra, and Rāma himself says इदानीमह महावीर सवृत्त - these references are found not in the authoritative text Janaka says वीरस्य तस्य महत (IV 12) referring to Rāma

(5) **Jatāyus**-He gave up his life in his attempt to rescue Sītā who was being carried off by Rāvana and Rāma refers to him as महान् तीर्थभूत साधु .

(6) **Viśvāmitra**—He is described as Dharma or Holy Religion incarnate by Kuśadhvaja[22], and his wonderful feats such as, helping Triśanku to go to heaven, the adoption of Śunahśepa and the thwarting of the Apsaras Rambhā are actually mentioned. (The expression Mahāvīrāh is used to refer to warriors in general.)

It is therefore clear that Bhavabhūti understands the word Vīra in an extended sense and is prepared to include Viśvāmitra also in the category of Vīras. The valiant monkey-chiefs are described as Vīras in the *Uttararāmacarita*[23]. Thus the title Mahāvīracarita is not intended to refer to Rāma only, but to five or six more characters in the play. Bhavabhūti uses the word Vīra about two hundred times in the *Mahāvīracarita*, and perhaps wants to show that Kālidāsa's use of the expression Vīra in connection with Agnimitra (as described in the *Mālavikāgnimitra*) is unjustified (see Bhavabhūti's Debt to Kālidāsa · Lecture III).

One thing deserves to be noted about the expression Mahāvīra. By Mahāvīra, the great Jaina Tīrthaṅkara, who was a contemporary of Gautama Buddha, is usually indicated (the expression occasi-

22. तुरीयो ह्येष मेध्याग्निराम्नाय पञ्चमोऽपि वा ।
अथवा जङ्गम तीर्थं धर्मो वा मूर्तिसचर ॥ *Mahāvīra* I 10
... न खलु विश्वामित्रादृषेर्महत्त्वेन कश्चिदपर प्रकृष्यते। यस्य भगवतस्त्रैशङ्कव शौन शेप रम्भास्तम्भन चेत्यपरिमेयमाश्चर्यंजातमाख्यानविद आचक्षते ।

23. उपायाना भावादविरतविनोदव्यतिकरै— (I 10 -).
विमर्दैर्वीराणा जगति जनितोऽत्यद्भुतरस ॥ (*Uttara* III,44).

onally refers to Gautama Buddha as well). Bhavabhūti possibly wants to suggest that the expression Mahāvīra can be justly applied to Vedic personages also, and it is not confined only to non-Vedic heroes Curiously enough, Bhavabhūti himself seems to have realised the futility of using well-known expressions in a different sense, and corrects himself accordingly, with the result that the word Mahāvīra does not occur even once in his two succeeding plays, the *Mālatīmādhava* and the *Uttararāmacarita*

(E) A Critical Estimate

There is every reason to believe that the *Mahāvīracarita* was the first work of Bhavabhūti Bhavabhūti appears to have been a young man when he wrote this play, full of enthusiasm, ready to chalk out new paths, and not afraid of going against conventional dogmas and practices

He describes thc Vīrarasa in the play, as domitnaing everything (Later on, he changed his view when he wrote the *Uttara* wherein the Karuna sentiment is said to be the ruling sentiment) He apparently was disgusted with the portrayal of the Śṛngāra sentiment in the dramas of Kālidāsa and Harsa, where the love of heroes (already married)for maidens had been described. He therefore goes to the other extreme and describes in *Mahāvīra* the love of Sītā (aged about six years) and Rāma (about twelve years), which consists in merely being attracted at first sight. He is out to describe wonderful deeds and finds ample material in the *Rāmāyana* for his purpose, and does not mind making changes wherever he thought it expedient to do so. The critics seem to be enraged at the distortion of the Rāma-story in the *Rāmāyana* and must not have spared Bhavabhūti in their adverse criticism, with the result

that Bhavabhūti in a more chastened mood, had to correct some of his earlier statements, in the *Uttara* In the *Mahāvīra*, Rāma goes to the forest straight after the marriage ceremony, the *Uttara* describes his stay[24] at Ayodhyā for some time at least, in the *Mahāvīra*, Kaikeyī is absolved from all blame (Śūrpanakhā is the real culprit); in the *Uttara*, Rāma skips over the Kaikeyī episode[25] In the *Mahāvīra*, Rāma is not to blame at all for Vālin's death, it was a fair fight between the two, in the *Uttara*, Rāma comes in for censure[26].

As a drama, judged by any standard, *Mahāvīra* must be described to be a failure :—

(1) None of the Unities are adequately dealt with The time taken by the plot is about fifteen years, the action takes place in different places,—the Siddhāśrama of Viśvāmitra, the Dandaka forest, and Lankā (about 1500 miles away). There is no Unity of Action, for, no properly developed action takes place at all. Rāma could be said to be the Hero, and Rāvana, the Pratināyaka, but they nowhere seem to assert their personality All those that are defeated by Rāma could be the Pratināyakas and they are indeed described as worthy opponents. All this makes for confusion and we find in the drama just a series of incidents or contests not sufficiently connected with one another

Bhavabhūti also displays a lamentable lack of the sense of proportion and does not appear to be aware of how ludicrous are some of his innovations, such as —the same expression uttered jointly; referring to the

---

24 आविवाहसमयाद् गृहे वने शैशवे तदनु यौवने पुन । (I.37)

25 अये, मध्यमाम्बावृत्तान्तमन्तरितमार्येण (I 21-1)

26 यद्वा कौशलमिन्द्रसूनुनिधने तत्राप्यभिज्ञो जन (V 34).

same person or even to different persons, too many incidents happening behind the curtain and so on

Act I—No reason is given why Kuśadhvaja brings with him Sītā and Urmilā except that the poet wills that they should fall in love with the two princes Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa.

The two princes jointly ask questions and give replies, the two princesses do the same, so also do Kuśadhvaja and Viśvāmitra !

The envoy from Rāvana has nothing to do, but keeps quiet, occasionally attempting to get a hearing.

Everything appears to be artificially managed. There are, however, some good verses pregnant with emotion.

Act II—Mālyavat is described as a great statesman, who weighs carefully the pros and cons and takes decision after mature consideration His scheme of inciting Paraśurāma to avenge upon Rāma, is well thought out; he certainly can not be blamed for its failure

When the enraged Paraśurāma arrives, instead of making Rāma go to meet him at once, the poet describes Rāma talking to Sītā for a pretty long time before confronting Paraśurāma.

The first impressions of Rāma and Paraśurāma on meeting each other are admirably described in simple and attractive style. Janaka and Śatānanda (the Purohita) arrive, not knowing what to do, when they find Paraśurāma standing at the threshold of the apartment ear-marked for ladies. Rāma is called to attend the Kankana-mocana ceremony and Paraśurāma allows him

to attend the ceremony, but warns him to return quickly

Act III—Vasistha and Viśvāmitra do their best to persuade Paraśurāma to desist from fighting with Rāma The description is in the best style of Bhavabhūti and a high dignified level is maintained throughout

But Bhavabhūti forgets himself in making Śatānanda hurl abusive epithets at[27] Paraśurāma Janaka and Daśaratha also try to mediate, but without success. Here we have Janaka, Daśaratha and Viśvāmitra jointly uttering the same verse (III. 39).

Act IV—Mālyavat, on hearing of Paraśurāma's defeat by Rāma, sends Śūrpanakhā in the guise of Mantharā (Kaikeyī's maid) to demand two boons promised by Daśaratha, one of which was to require Rāma to go into exile Mālyavat is sure that Rāma would abide by the wishes of Daśaratha, and it would then be easy enough to abduct Sītā and to kill Rāma if possible in the forest. The scheme is partially successful and Rāma willingly goes into exile, with Sītā and Laksmana The parting of Rāma from Daśaratha and Bharata is admirably described.

Act V—Rāma's meeting with Jatāyus and his fight with Vālin (which was the result of the machinations of Mālyavat) are also described in apt words.

On the whole, it can be said that Bhavabhūti has succeeded in giving his readers a proper insight into the characters of the various personages in the drama, in well-chosen words, but as a drama, the *Mahāvīracarita* shows nothing really dramatic about it.

---

27. अनड्वन्, पुरुषाधम, निरपराधराजन्यकुलकदन, महापातकिन्, अशिष्ट, विकृतवेष, बीभत्सकर्मन्, अपूर्वपाषण्ड, काण्डीर, काण्डपृष्ठ (III 18.3)

Wilson's estimate of the present play, which is perhaps more sympathetic than necessary, is as follows:— "The situation and sentiment of the drama are of a stirring and martial description and the language is adapted with singular facility to the subjects from which it springs It is sonorous and masculine, more vigorous than musical, and although highly elaborate and sometimes rigid is in general chaste and always classical and stately"

Mālatīmadhava

Bhavabhūti, smarting under the adverse criticism (which he regarded as unjust) levelled against the *Mahāvīracarita*, decided to write an original play, evolved out of his own brain, which ruled out of order any emendation of the Epic stories, that might have provided some material for adverse criticism He, however, retains his defiant spirit, telling his critics that they are unfit to appreciate his work and Time alone would produce, somewhere, a kindred spirit that would do justice to him [28]

(A) The Plot

The following is the plot of the play —

Act I—Bhūrivasu (minister at Padmāvatī), and Devarāta (minister to the King of Vidarbha), while studying together years ago, had made a vow in the presence of Kāmandakī (a co-student) that they would join their children in wed-lock, if feasible Bhūrivasu had a daughter, Mālatī by name, and Devarāta, a son

---

28. ये नाम केचिदिह न प्रथयन्त्यवज्ञा
जानन्ति ते किमपि तान्प्रति नैष यत्न ।
उत्पत्स्यतेऽस्ति मम कोऽपि समानधर्मा
कालो ह्यय निरवधिर्विपुला च पृथ्वी ॥ (*Mālatī* I 6).

Mādhava by name Bhūrivasu had apparently forgotten his vow, so Devarāta had sent his son Mādhava to study Ānvīkṣikī at Padmāvatī, as a sort of reminder to Bhūrivasu Kāmandakī had set her heart on bringing about the marriage of Mādhava and Mālatī, and so had arranged that Mādhava should pass by Mālatī's mansion often, so that she should see Mādhava and fall in love with him.

In the meanwhile, the King of Padmāvatī expressed his desire that Mālatī should be married to Nandana, his narma-saciva. Kāmandakī thereupon decided that a stolen marriage between Mādhava and Mālatī was the only remedy. But that was not an easy task, for Mālatī had a very high sense of honour and thought highly of her duty to her father. Kāmandakī therefore proceeds very cautiously Although a Samnyāsini, Kāmandakī, who loved Mālati very much, asks her attendant Avalokitā to arrange to send Mādhava to the Madana-garden, so that he might be able to see Mālatī at close quarters there, at the Madana-festival, another attendant of Kāmandaki, Buddharakṣitā is commissioned to work on the mind of Madayantikā (Nandana's sister), so that she should be attracted by Makaranda, Mādhava's friend. Mālati's foster-sister Lavaṅgikā also arranges to send the portrait of Mādhava drawn by Mālati to Mādhava, through Mandārikā who is loved by Kalahamsaka, Mādhava's follower

As arranged, Mādhava sees Mālati in the Madana-garden Lavangikā also succeeds in taking away from Mādhava the Bakula-garland which he had been wearing, conveying to him Mālati's love in a clever speech. While Mādhava is relating these events to Makaranda, Kalahamsaka brings the portrait of

Mādhava drawn by Mālatī, Mādhava draws Mālatī's portrait by the side of his portrait, and is extremely tormented by love.

Act II—Mālatī,on her return from the Madana-garden was acquainted by Lavangikā with her interview with Mādhava.

The King of Padmāvatī asks Bhūrivasu for the hand of Mālatī on behalf of Nandana, and the minister replies that His Majesty has full power over his (King's, Bhūrivasu's) daughter.

Lavaṅgikā hands over the Bakula-garland to Mālatī and shows her the portrait drawn by Mādhava. Mālatī is convinced that Mādhava loves her, but solemnly declares that she would rather die than bring disgrace on her parents and family by defying her parents and agreeing to a stolen marriage. Kāmandakī expresses her great concern for Mālatī, but cleverly adds that the course of conduct followed by Śakuntalā, Urvaśī and Vāsavadattā in similar cases, could not be suggested to Mālatī Kāmandakī narrates details about Mādhava and is pleased to find that Mālatī's resolve had become somewhat shaky.

Act III—Several days have passed, and thanks to Buddharakṣitā's efforts, Madayantikā has begun to take interest in Makaranda Kāmandakī arranges a meeting of Mādhava and Mālatī in the Kusumākara garden (Mālatī is induced to go there to collect flowers with her own hands for the worship of Śiva on the Kṛṣnacaturdaśī day).

Mādhava goes to the Kusumākara garden and is able to overhear the conversation between Mālatī, Lavaṅgikā and Kāmandakī. Lavaṅgikā describes Mālatī's

love-agony at great length in reply to Kāmandakī's description of the love-torment of Mādhava

All of a sudden a cry is heard that a tiger had broken loose from the cage and was on the point of attacking Madayantikā, when Mādhava discloses himself. The whole party moves hurriedly only to find that Makaranda, coming there all of a sudden, had killed the tiger and saved Madayantikā's life. Makaranda, however, is wounded in the attempt and faints away.

Act IV—On seeing Makaranda in a swoon, Mādhava faints away They both soon recover when a messenger brings the news that Mālati had been betrothed to Nandana by the King's order. Madayantikā is over-joyed to hear that Mālati was to be her brother's wife. Kāmandaki tries to cheer up Mādhava by explaining that Bhūrivasu had not given his consent to the proposed match, as his words 'The great king has full power over his daughter'—meant simply that the king was free to give away *his own* daughter, not, Bhūrivasu's daughter But Mādhava is full of despair, and as a last resort resolves upon being a vendor of human flesh in the cemetery, and returns to the city with Makaranda

Act V.— The Kāpālika, Aghoraghaṇṭa has completed his Mantrasādhana, and his pupil Kapālakundalā travels through the air to Padmāvati in search of a beautiful maiden for being offered as a victim to the goddess Karālā, to commemorate the event. She is able to spot Mādhava in the cemetery and recognises in him the son of Kāmandakī's friend.

Mādhava offers human flesh to the spirits in the cemetery, but they vanish away. A cry for help is

heard from the temple of Karālā, and Mādhava rushes to the temple, to save in the nick of time Mālatī who was being offered as a victim by Aghoraghanta and Kapālakundalā Mādhava rescues Mālatī and fights with Aghoraghanta

In the meanwhile, soldiers arrive to besiege the temple, under instructions from Kāmandakī

Act VI—Aghoraghanta is killed by Mādhava who spares the life of Kapālakundalā who, however, decides to avenge herself upon Mādhava in some way by taking advantage of the confusion during the impending festivities on account of the marriage of Nandana and Mālatī.

According to custom, Mālatī goes to worship the City-deity before the marriage Lavangikā and Kāmandakī accompany her A special bridal dress for Mālatī is sent by the King for the occasion Mālatī and Lavangikā enter the inner sanctuary (garbha-gṛha) of the temple, where are concealed Mādhava and Makaranda as directed by Kāmandakī Mālatī confesses her love for Mādhava and requests Lavangikā to help her to put an end to her life and falls at her feet (Mādhava quietly changes places with Lavangikā) Mālatī requests Lavangikā (Mādhava) to always remember Mādhava, and wants to put the Bakula-garland which had sustained her so far, round her neck. As she touches Mādhava's body, she starts back in shame Mādhava confesses his intense love for Mālatī; Kāmandakī (who had remained outside, apparently engaged in examining the bridal dress and ornaments) enters the garbha-grha and cheers up the lovers by proposing a secret marriage She also asks Makaranda to put on the bridal dress and masquerade as Mālatī.

Mādhava and Mālati go unobserved to Kāmandakī's abode where Avalokitā had made all preparations for the marriage-ceremony.

Act VII—Nandana's marriage was duly celebrated, and Makaranda played his part as Mālati, without arousing any suspicion. The advances of Nandana were repelled by Makaranda and Nandana left the apartment in great hauteur, declaring that he would have nothing to do with the harlot-maiden Mālatī

Madayantikā arrives with Buddharaksitā to reason with Mālatī for her rude behaviour. Makaranda pretends to be asleep Lavangikā throws all blame upon Nandana Madayantikā explains that her brother's abuse of Mālatī was due to the reported love of Mālatī for Mādhava In the course of conversation, Madayantikā confesses her love for Makaranda, and is prevailed upon by Lavangikā and Buddharaksitā to be ready even for a Gāndharva-marriage.Madayantikā wishes to return to her abode, when Makaranda shows himself and takes her hand, declaring his love for her. All, under cover of darkness, start for Kāmandaki's abode where Mālati and Mādhava had already gone.

Act VIII—Mādhava and Mālati are enjoying the moon-light after marriage, when Buddharaksitā, Lavaṅgikā, Madayantikā and Kalahamsaka arrive with the news that Makaranda had been engaged in an encounter with the city-police. Mādhava and Kalahamsaka rush on to help Makaranda. Mālati sends Buddharaksitā and Avalokitā to inform Kāmandaki of the incident and deputes Lavangikā to Mādhava to request him to be cautious.

Kapālakundalā, finding Mālati alone takes her away to Sriparvata, with a view to put her to death.

When Mādhava and Makaranda return, after a successful fight with the police, they find that Mālatī had disappeared, and they repair to Kāmandakī's abode, thinking that Mālatī might have gone there.

Act IX—Saudāminī (a good Kāpālikā) comes to Padmāvatī, with the Bakula-garland as the token of recognition, to inform Mādhava that Mālatī was safe

In the meanwhile, Mādhava, stricken with grief, wanders all over the place in company of Makaranda in search of Mālatī, addressing clouds, peacocks, Kokilas, monkeys, elephants etc., for news about his beloved, and ultimately faints away. Makaranda, unable to bear his torment, decides to throw himself into the river Pātalāvatī, when Saudāminī appears and informs him about Mālatī being safe. On Mādhava's recovery, Saudāminī drops into his hand the Bakula-garland and informs him that Mālatī had been carried off by Kapālakuṇḍalā Suddenly she flies up, taking Mādhava with her Makaranda goes to Kāmandakī to inform her of the latest developments.

Act X— Kāmandakī, Lavangikā and Madayantikā decide to commit suicide by throwing themselves down from a hill adjoining the Madhumatī river. Bhūrivasu is also going to Suvarṇabindu for the same purpose. Mādhava and Mālatī are brought there from Śrīparvata by Saudāminī who also prevents Bhūrivasu from committing suicide. Saudāminī, who is an old pupil of Kāmandakī, bows down to her, and produces a letter from the King, giving his approval to the marriage of Mālatī and Mādhava, and that of Madayantikā and Makaranda. Everything thus ends happily for all.

(B) Malatīmādhava : A Prakaraṇa

Mālatīmādhava is technically called a Prakaraṇa. Bharata defines a Prakarana as follows :—

आत्मशक्त्या कविर्यत्र कथा नायकमेव च ।
औत्पत्तिक प्रकुरुते तद्धि प्रकरण विदु ॥
द्विधा प्रकरण तत्तु शुद्ध सकीर्णमेव च ।
कुलस्त्रीरचित शुद्ध सकीर्ण वेश्यया कृतम् ॥

(*Nāṭyaśāstra*)

The *Sāhityadarpaṇa* says—

भवेत्प्रकरण वृत्त लौकिक कविकल्पित ।
शृङ्गारोऽङ्गी नायकस्तु विप्रोऽमात्योऽथवा वणिक् ।
सोपायधर्मकामार्थपरो धीरप्रशान्तक ॥

Thus the plot of a Prakarana has to be an invention of the poet dealing with worldly life. The hero may be a Brāhmana, or a minister, or a merchant. The heroine may be a courtezan (as in the *Mṛcchakaṭika*) or a lady of noble birth. The number of Acts should be usually ten. In all other respects it is akin to a Nāṭaka

It is easy to see that the *Mālatīmādhava* conforms to the above requirements—

(1) The plot can be said to be substantially an original one (see next Section. Sources) and does not deal with divine or semi-divine beings.

(2) The hero (Mādhava) is son of a minister.

(3) The heroine is a Kulastrī (the Prakarana is thus of the Śuddha (pure) variety).

(4) There are ten Acts, the maximum number allowed. (The poet seems to have artificially made up this number. Thus- There is no interval between Acts I and II, Acts III and IV, and Acts IX and X.

These six Acts could easily be condensed into three only. It is also likely that the exigencies of stage-arrangement had led to the division into more Acts than what was absolutely necessary)

(5) The Śṛngāra-sentiment is predominant (The love-affairs of Mādhava and Makaranda are described at great length, and Kalahamsaka, a minor character, is also engaged in love-making).

(C) Sources of Mālatīmādhava

Though the theorists declare that the plot of a Prakarana should be Kavikalpita, it is impossible to evolve such a plot in practice, especially for a Sanskrit poet who is confronted with older works like the *Mahābhārata* (with its boast—whatever is not here, is not found anywhere), the *Rāmāyaṇa* and *Kathāsaritsāgara* (the Sanskrit rendering of the *Bṛhatkathā* in the Paiśācī language, recording wonderful stories of Yakṣas, Gandharvas etc) It is always possible, therefore, for a critic to point out to possible sources of the plot of a Sanskrit Drama.

Bhavabhūti himself describes his *Mālatīmādhava* as a wonderful, variegated, charming and brilliant, long Prakarana[29], and the plot as full of sentiments, and attractive[30] It would be safe to assume that the poet thinks very highly of the following incidents depicted by him—

(1) The substitution episode where Makaranda (a male) impersonates Mālatī (the heorine) (Act VI)

---

29. अस्ति वा कुतश्चिदेवभूतमद्भुत विचित्ररमणीयोज्ज्वल महाप्रकरणम् ।
(X 23 16-17)

30. अहो, सरसरमणीयता सविधानकस्य । (VI 13 3)

(2) The romantic *imposition* on Mālatī when Mādhava (Act VII) takes the place of Lavangikā in the temple.

(3) The confession of her love by Madayantikā for Makaranda, unaware of the fact that she was speaking in the presence of Makaranda himself who was masquerading as Mālatī (Act VII).

(4) Mādhava engaged in selling human flesh (Act V).

(5) The rescue of Mālatī by Mādhava, when she was about to be killed by Aghoraghaṇṭa (Act VI).

(6) The rescue of Madayantikā from a tiger by Makaranda.

(So also, the power of travelling through the air, possessed by Saudāminī and Kapālakundalā, males and females studying together, and so forth).

Most of the incidents referred to above are found in the stories from the *Kathāsaritsāgara* Thus—

(A) (1) In the story of Madirāvatī (XIII Lambaka) there is the impersonation of Madirāvatī by her lover's friend, and his meeting with his lady-love, while in the garb of Madirāvatī, the meeting of the lovers in the inner sanctuary of the temple, and the rescue of his lady-love from an elephant (Bhavabhūti substitutes a tiger) by the second Brāhmana boy, etc.

There is in this story, also the presentation of a Mālatīmālā by Madirāvatī's foster-sister to her lover (in the *Mālatī*, Mādhava presents a Bakulamālā to Mālatī's foster-sister; the name of the heroine in the play also was perhaps suggested by the Mālatīmālā); reference to Rukminī's abduction by Krsna, etc

(2) The story of Madanamañjarī and Khandakapāla (Lambaka, XVII. 2), and that of Aśokadatta and Rākṣasa refer to the selling of human flesh[31].

(3) The names of Saudāminī, Padmāvatī and others are found in the *Kathā*, as also similarities of descriptions of the cemetery, love-agony etc. (these, however, cannot be classed as cases of definite borrowing on the part of the poet)

(B) Bhavabhūti seems to be deliberately borrowing from Kālidāsa, as though challenging him and showing how he can better Kālidāsa's description

In Act IX, the description of Mādhava's pangs on the disappearance of Mālatī, is modelled on that of Purūravas by Kālidāsa in *Vikram* (Act IV) Bhavabhūti adds to the list of birds and beasts addressed by the lover in *Vikram*, by including a monkey.

If Kālidāsa uses the Hariṇī metre(सुतनु हृदयात्प्रत्यादेश .. Act VII Śāk.) in the hero's address to the heroine, Mādhava also must do the same in *Mālatī*, similes also are drawn upon and so forth. (However, Bhavabhūti does not appear to have improved upon Kālidāsa, in spite of his efforts).

Similarly, the reference to Śakuntalā and Urvaśī in the passage यच्च किल कौशिकी शकुन्तला दुष्यन्तमप्सरा पुरूरवस चकम उर्वशीत्याख्यानविद आचक्षते (Act II. 7. 12-13) is put in to show that Mālati is superior to Kālidāsa's heroines, who declares that in her eyes, parents and the honour of the family are to be taken into account[32] in preference to the lover and even one's own life.

---

31. विक्रीणानो महामास गृह्यतामिति घोषयन् ।
नृमासमस्मि विक्रीणे गृह्यतामित्युवाच स । (*Kathā* P 105)

32. मम तु दयित श्लाघ्यस्तातो जनन्यमलान्वया
कुलममलिन (*Mālatī* II 2)

The verse[33] which belittles the knowledge of the Vedas, Upanisads, Sānkhya and Yoga in a dramatist, seems to be a hit against Kālidāsa who, according to Bhavabhūti, lacks the essential qualities that make a drama a success.

Even if it is granted that there is a conscious or unconscious borrowing from Gunādhya and Kālidāsa, on the part of Bhavabhūti, it must be conceded that the plot of the *Mālatīmādhava* is an original one invented by the poet. What Bhavabhūti has done, and for which he deserves ample praise, is that he has utilised the various incidents from these sources in one and the same plot, thus heightening the total effect, and the incidents are shown to follow a logical sequence Bhavabhūti indeed shows too many incidents as happening accidentally, but that need not be objected to, as it is often noticed that truth is stranger than fiction and the long arm of coincidence does make itself felt in a surprising manner in actual life Bhavabhūti has also succeeded in blending together in a harmonious way the two love-episodes, those of Mādhava and Makaranda.

(D) A Critical Appreciation

It has been mentioned in the last section what estimate Bhavabhūti makes of his own play *Mālatī* The drama is certainly—

(1) Vast in size, consisting of ten Acts

(2) Vicitra or variegated (*a*) containing a variety of incidents, such as the rescue of Madayantikā and Mālatī from a tiger and Aghoraghanta respectively,

---

33 यद्वेदाध्ययन तथोपनिषदा साङ्ख्यस्य योगस्य च
ज्ञान तत्कथनेन कि न हि तत कश्चिद्गुणो नाटके । (*Mālatī* 1. 7)

the conflict with the city-police, the orgy of the ghosts in the cemetery, the impersonation of Mālatī by Makaranda; (*b*) depicting a variety of characters–Mādhava, sentimental and philosophical; Makaranda, brave and amiable; Mālatī, shy and hesitating; Madayantikā, lovely and vivacious, Kāmandakī, womanly, wise and scheming.

(3) Charming and bright—on account of the scenes, where Mālatī and Madayantikā give vent to their feelings, freely and without reserve, unaware of the presence of their lovers, and where Kāmandakī and others, unable to bear their grief, are ready to end their lives

Bhavabhūti also claims that his play contains the requisites that go to make an ideal drama[34], such as dignity and felicity of expression, and the depth of sense .—

The dignity and felicity of expression are well illustrated in the descriptions of the cemetery by Mādhava (Act V), and the surroundings of Padmāvatī by Saudāminī (Act IX) and the pathetic wailings of Kāmandakī, Makaranda and Mādhava (Acts X and IX) etc.

The depth of sense is exhibited in passages where the love-agonies are described in detail and the various incidents are portrayed graphically—

To achieve all this, the poet uses the appropriate metres. The Dandaka metre (54 syllables in a quarter) is aptly chosen to describe the formidable goddess Cāmundā, similarly the Śārdūlavikrīdita is used to

34. यत्प्रौढत्वमुदारता च वचसा यच्चार्थतो गौरवम्।
तच्चेदस्ति ततस्तदेव गमक पाण्डित्यवैदग्ध्ययो । (*Mālatī* 1. 7)

describe the Heroic and the Bībhatsa sentiments, and the Mandākrāntā, Harinī, Mālinī are preferred to portray the softer sentiments Bhavabhūti's vocabulary appears to be extensive enough and he is not afraid to coin new expressions for the sake of alliteration.He has given in this play two verses which can be read as both Sanskrit and Prakrit verses

The play is full of proverbial passages and the poet gives his views on family life and the sanctity of the marriage-bond etc. in a charming manner[35]

There are, however, some serious drawbacks which mar the right appreciation of the play as a whole. To begin with, it appears that there is no Unity of Action in the play (The Unity of Time may be taken to be there, as the action in the play takes about three months, from the beginning of spring to the beginning of the rainy season; most of the incidents happen in or about Padmāvatī, so the Unity of Place is also observed fairly well). We have really two actions and they run on parallel lines. The main purpose in the play is the union of Mālatī and Mādhava, the subsidiary action being concerned with the union of Makaranda and Madayantikā. But, on account of the very important part played by Makaranda and the extremely arresting character of Madayantikā, the main action is put into the shade to a certain extent Makaranda steals a march over Mādhava in rescuing his beloved from a tiger, and the rescue of Mālatī by Mādhava, coming after that event, suffers on that very account, as it looks like an imitation. Mādhava takes the place of Lavaṅgikā in the temple and is able to hear Mālatī's confession of love for him. But this episode, charming as it is, is

---

35. *Mālatī* Act X. 5, 6, VI. 18, VII 2, etc

completely overshadowed by the excellently conceived and cleverly depicted scene where Makaranda (in the garb of Mālatī) *imposes upon* Madayantikā.

Mādhava himself suffers considerably in comparison with Makaranda. Mādhava has an affectionate nature and is undoubtedly brave, but he talks and behaves like a fool; while Makaranda is brave and keeps cool in adverse circumstances, and his chivalrous nature and disregard for life for the sake of others stand out prominently Likewise, Mālati pales into insignificance before the talkative, vivacious and shrewd Madayantikā In this way both the official hero, Mādhava, and the official heroine Mālati do not carry their due weight in the play, with the result that the sub-plot overshadows almost in all respects the main plot (The two plots are, however, cleverly knit together by the poet by depicting Madayantikā as the sister of Nandana, Mādhava's rival for the hand of Mālatī, and Makaranda's falling in love with Madayantikā)

In accordance with the generally accepted conventions about drama, the Pratināyaka has to be given a prominent status, but the Pratināyaka (Nandana) in this play is not deemed fit even to appear on the stage, one simply hears about Nandana in the play (This is perhaps one of the items contributing to the *adbhutatva* in the play!)

Macdonell calls the *Mālatīmādhava* as a sort of *Romeo and Juliet* with a happy ending, the part played by the nun Kāmandakī being analogous to that of Friar Laurence in Shakespeare's drama (Bhavabhūti created the character of Kāmandakī presumably to score over Kālidāsa's Parivrājikā in the *Mālavikāgnimitra*). Kāmandakī, however, plays a far more impor-

tant role and justly deserves the title 'Kāryanidhāna' (Main-spring of activity) in Act X Like an army-commander she appreciates the various situations clearly and correctly and lays her plans accordingly, being ready for any emergency She manages the impersonation of Mālatī by Makaranda, keeps everything ready for the stolen marriage, and rightly arranges to appease the wrath of the King and Nandana, by marrying Madayantikā to Makaranda. She takes the fullest advantage of the events as they occur and is also aided by luck to surmount difficulties which she could not have overcome The poet describes her as being able to command the assistance of the King's soldiers, and although a Samnyāsinī who has renounced the world in theory, she shows herself to be a wonderful match-maker which role wordly women in general love to play (This is perhaps another item contributing to the *adbhutatva* of the drama)

Though the poet has tried his best to show that the various incidents follow logically and in proper co-ordination, he could not be said to have succeeded in his task. Dr. Bhandarkar makes the following astute observations in this connection -'Notwithstanding originality of conception involved in the plot of *Mālatīmādhava*, the poet does not show such a skill in the arrangement of his incidents and in the denouement as is displayed by the author of the *Mṛcchakaṭika* or even of the *Mudrārākṣasa* The incidents subsequent to the scene in the cemetery look like clumsy appendages and not like parts of a whole. Kapālakundalā is represented to have taken away Mālatī simply to give an opportunity to the poet to display his power of depicting the feelings of a man in *viraha*; and the incident

appears by no means to harmonise with, or to arise naturally out of, the previous story.' There would be no difficulty in agreeing to the above criticism. As has been already pointed out, the whole of the ninth Act is but a poor imitation of Kālidāsa's fourth Act in the *Vikramorvaśīya.* It might be argued that Kapālakundalā, incensed at the murder of her preceptor by Mādhava, is perfectly justified in seeking avenues to harm Mādhava, and what better method than that of abducting Mālatī again (she had abducted Mālatī before, to offer her as a victim to Karālā) could be found ? And this second abduction gives the poet an opportunity to make use of Saudāminī referred to in the first Act. This is true enough, but this purpose could have been best achieved in a perfectly natural manner by the arrival of Saudāminī in the nick of time in Act VIII, to prevent Kapālakundalā from carrying off Mālatī. The play could have reasonably ended with Act VIII, as the King had already been pleased with the valour of Mādhava and Makaranda whom he regards as ideal sons-in-law. The ninth Act, therefore, cannot be said to arise naturally out of the story. It is there because the poet desires to beat Kālidāsa on his own ground (that he does not seem to have met with much success there, is another matter).

The general impression left on the mind of the reader on struggling through the play is that he has been made to move in a more or less unreal world where too many important events happen by accident such as the tiger-episode which makes it possible for Kāmandakī to achieve her second purpose, viz the union of Makaranda and Madayantikā, and the killing of Aghoraghanta by Mādhava Both Mādhava and Makaranda save their beloveds through sheer luck

which also is responsible for the invaluable help rendered by Saudāminī to the hero.

The lack of a sense of proportion on the part of the dramatist is too glaring to be missed Mādhava is made to describe his love-agony (when only an hour had passed after the sight of Mālatī at close quarters) in a manner which would appear exaggerated even in the case of a hardened lover suffering for years ! The poet's intention is to describe the course of love of youthful lovers, but when the poet seriously tells us that Mādhava began to love Mālatī by repeatedly passing by the royal road by Mālatī's mansion and looking upwards at her sitting presumably in the gallery, without attracting the attention of others, he is crediting his readers with very little intelligence. (Both Mādhava and Mālatī must be supposed to have exceedingly powerful eyes to look at each other from such a distance) Such long-range love-making makes the whole thing look ridiculous. That Mādhava who was intended to study Ānvīkṣikī at Padmāvatī,should be engaged in practising Īksana of a maiden may be passed over, but the whole love-procedure is too much conventional The warning about the tiger being abroad is given in a very long passage, allowing the tiger to inflict a dozen casualities in the meanwhile !

Again, the characters in the drama, including the hero, faint so often that they lose the sympathy of the reader; when the necessity for quick action is there, the hero either tarries on for describing his appreciation of his lady-love or faints away ! There is also a competition to commit suicide amongst the various characters in the last Act. All this is not calculated to impress a sympathetic reader or critic.

Another serious drawback about Bhavabhūti's works is that he creates the impression of having some ready verses and expressions at his command, which he is determined to make use of, when a semblance of an opportunity presents itself. This accounts for the very large number of whole verses or parts of verses and expressions found in more than one drama of his.

On the whole, the *Mālatīmādhava* can be regarded as a good drama in spite of the various drawbacks pointed out above, not on the strength of the *adbhutatva* associated with its plot, but of the many highly poetical and pathetic passages therein. The critics apparently had not thought highly of it which makes the poet have a dig at them in the Prologue to his next play, the *Uttararāmacarita*, when he says यथा स्त्रीणा तथा वाचा साधुत्वे दुर्जनो जन ।

LECTURE III

DRAMAS OF BHAVABHŪTI

Uttararāmacarita

The *Uttararāmacarita*, as the very name implies, deals with the later history of Rāma, from the coronation after Rāma's return from exile, to his re-union with Sītā whom he abandoned immediately after his coronation and his two sons Kuśa and Lava, covering a period of more than twelve years.

(A) The Plot

Act I— The coronation ceremonies at Ayodhyā are over and the invited guests have taken their departure The Queen-mothers, Vasistha and Arundhatī also leave Ayodhyā to attend the Twelve-year sacrifice of Rṣyaśrnga, Rāma's brother-in-law. Rāma, with his brothers and Sītā is left alone at Ayodhyā. The citizens of Ayodhyā are not quite satisfied with the Fire-ordeal undergone by Sītā in Laṅkā, to prove her chastity, and a whispering campaign about her is afoot in the Capital.

Rāma is engaged in comforting Sītā who is feeling dejected on account of the departure of all the relatives Astāvakra arrives from the hermitage of Rsyaśṛnga with a message to Rāma from the Queen-mothers and Vasistha The mothers-in-law of Sītā want Rāma to fulfil the pregnancy-longing of Sītā without any hesitation Vasistha wants Rāma to regard the contentment of the people as the one important goal to be aimed at by a king. Rāma declares then that he is prepared to sacrifice his all, including even Sītā to appease his people. After

Astāvakra's departure, Laksmaṇa requests Rāma to look at the paintings depicting the various episodes in Rāma's career, up to the purification of Sītā by fire. The following episodes are directly mentioned -

(1) The Jrmbhaka missiles always in attendance on Rāma. (Rāma tells Sītā that the missiles would be attending upon her progeny as well).

(2) The marriage-ceremonies at Mithilā, where Rāma and his brothers were married (here Sītā humorously wants Laksmana to announce the name of his wife, whom he had omitted to point out; a Hindu orthodox husband is not supposed to utter the name of the wife).

(3) Rāma's encounter with Paraśurāma (Rāma wants to skip over this, as he abhors self-glorification and shows his modesty by bowing to Paraśurāma)

(4) Mantharā episode (Rāma skips over it In the *Mahāvīra*, she is really Śūrpanakhā in disguise and so Kaikeyī is not involved at all)

(5, 6) The Ingudī tree in Śrngavera city, where Rāma met Guha, the Nisāda-chief, the tying of the matted hair at the commencement of the exile-march

(7) The Bhāgīrathī river (Rāma prays to the river to look upon Sītā as her daughter-in-law)

(8) The Vata tree called Śyāma (which brings back to Rāma's mind the days he had passed in that region so happily)

(9-19) The encounter with the demon Virādha, the entry into the Southern Forest, the hill Prasravana, the Śūrpanakhā episode in Pañcavati; the abduction of Sītā in Janasthāna, the death of Jatāyu while trying to rescue Sītā, the Citrakūta region and the

headless demon Danu; the hermitage of Mataṅga, the Śabarī, Śramaṇā, the lake Pampā, Hanūmat.

(20) The Mālyavat mountain (Here Rāma completely breaks down, on remembering the events following Sītā's abduction)

Finding Sītā tired, Lakṣmana stops showing up the paintings and Sītā says that the sight of the pictures had made her long for a stay in the groves on the banks of the Bhāgīrathī. Rāma immediately asks Lakṣmana to take Sītā to those regions (as the Queen-mothers had directed Rāma to fulfil Sītā's pregnancy-longing without hesitation) Lakṣmaṇa goes out to get the chariot ready. Sītā sleeps on, using Rāma's hand as a pillow, completely at peace. While Rāma is congratulating himself on his superb marital happiness, Durmukha, the C I. D Chief brings the astounding news that the citizens of Ayodhyā suspected the chastity of Sītā. Rāma decides to abandon Sītā rather than to allow the glorious name of the Solar race tarnished (all the while Rāma is conscious that in doing so, he was acting more atrociously than even a butcher). A deputation of ascetics living on the Yamunā arrives to request Rāma to save them from the depredations of the demon Lavana. Rāma orders Śatrughna to attack Lavaṇa and takes leave of Sītā (who is asleep) with a heavy heart. On awakening from her dream-sleep, Sītā is escorted by Durmukha to the chariot, on her way to the Bhāgīrathī regions.

Act II.— Twelve years have passed since Sītā was abandoned. The situation at the end of this period was as under:—

(1) The sage Vālmīki had composed the Rāma-story in a strange non-vedic metre.

(2) Vālmīki had two infants brought to him twelve years ago, whom he had named Kuśa and Lava, and they were taught by him all sciences including the science of archery

(3) Rāma had begun the Aśvamedha sacrifice with Sītā's golden image as his consort (Rāma had not remarried).

(4) A Brāhmaṇa had lost his son prematurely (a premature death of any one among the subjects could take place only as a result of the King's dereliction of duty) and the Brāhmana asks Rāma to set matters right.

(5) On inquiry Rāma finds that one Śambūka had been practising penance in an unauthorised manner, and rushes in his Puspaka aerial car to punish him and he was expected to arrive in the Dandaka forest soon

(All this information is given to Vāsantī, the sylvan Deity in the Dandaka forest, by Ātreyī who had been a student of philosophy under Vālmīki, but who had decided to leave Vālmīki (who had accepted two very brilliant lads as pupils with whom it was impossible for Ātreyī to keep pace) and study under another teacher in the south).

Rāma finds Śambūka and kills him. Śambūka emerges in a heavenly form and brings a message to Rāma from Agastya and his wife Lopāmudrā to pay a visit to them.

Act III—Rāma's arrival in the Daṇḍaka forest has created a great stir there. Every one is afraid that the sight of the Daṇḍaka forest with its surroundings, where he had lived with Sītā during the exile, would

affect Rāma considerably. So, the river Godāvarī is enjoined to waft about cool breezes now and then, and Bhāgīrathī (with whom Sītā had stayed in the Pātāla after her delivery of twin sons who had been placed in charge of Vālmīki (this had been a closely guarded secret)— as Macdonell points out-this furnishes a striking parallel to the two princes Guiderius and Arniragus who are brought up by the hermit Belarius in Shakespeare's *Cymbeline*) had arranged to bring Sītā there under the pretext of performing some rites on the Twelfth-Anniversary of the birth of the twins, and to stay invisible by the side of Rāma (Sītā would thus be convinced of Rāma's feelings for her). Tamasā and Vāsantī would also be with Sītā.

While the invisible Sītā is wandering there, she finds her pet elephant (which she had reared up twelve years ago) attacked by an older elephant Rāma hears the cry for help from Vāsantī, rushes to the spot, but finds that the younger one had already emerged triumphant Sītā is remieded of her sons whom she visualises as sufficiently grown up by that time. Rāma, as was feared, faints again, but is revived by the touch (which Rāma recognises too well) of the invisible Sītā. Vāsantī welcomes Rāma and upbraids him for the ill-treatment meted out to Sītā but Sītā stops her (Vāsantī could see Sītā and talk to her). Sītā hears from Rāma's own lips that he had her golden image as his consort at the Aśvamedha sacrifice and feels that by that very act Rāma had made ample amends to her Rāma then returns to Ayodhyā.

Act IV–After the Twelve-year sacrifice of Ṛsyaśṛnga is over, Vasistha, Arundhatī and Kausalyā go to stay at Vālmīki's hermitage, as none of them

wanted to go to Ayodhyā from which Sītā had been banished. Janaka also comes there when Rāma's sacrificial horse was wandering in the precincts. The party meets the hermitage-boys among whom is seen Lava who bears a great resemblance to Rāma and Sītā. The party requests Vālmīki to give them details about the boy, but they are told that all would be known in due course (only Arundhatī had known the secret from Bhāgīrathī).

Lava resents the proclamation by the guardians of the horse, challenging any one to capture the horse. Lava captures the horse.

Act V-- Lava easily defeats the guardians of the horse and renders them motionless by using the Jṛmbhaka missile Lava then meets the Commandant Candraketu himself. Both Lava and Candraketu are impressed by each other's appearance,and are unwilling to fight. Sumantra, Candraketu's charioteer sees a great resemblance between Rāma and Lava Explaining his reasons for capturing the sacrificial horse, Lava says that he did not like the insulting words of the guardians, which were derogatory to all Kṣatriyas, when Candraketu expressed surprise at Lava's intolerance of even Rāma's prowess Lava remarks that prowess was not the monopoly of any one, and the less one speaks of Rāma's prowess, the better, looking to the following facts- (1) the killing of Tādakā, a woman, (2) taking three steps backwards, while fighting with Khara, and (3) the unjust murder of Vālin. Candraketu, highly incensed at this deliberate insult to Rāma, decides to fight out the issue and Lava and Candraketu repair to a suitable spot to fight.

Act VI-The duel between Lava and Candraketu raged on furiously for a long time, during which various missiles were used by both Rāma comes on the scene and puts an end to the fight. Lava's twin brother Kuśa also arrives and Rāma is wonderstruck at the resemblance between himself and the two brothers On hearing more details from Lava and Kuśa, he is almost convinced that they were his own sons He argues as follows —

(1) Sītā had been abandoned in the same forest-region

(2) The two brothers resembled him and Sītā very much

(3) The Jṛmbhaka missiles were at their command.

(4) His heart had been thrilled at their sight.

(5) The age of the brothers was in consonance with the theory of their being sons of the pregnant abandoned Sītā twelve years ago—

(6) And Rāma himself had suspected that Sītā would give birth to twins

Kuśa and Lava innocently recite some passages from the *Rāmāyana*, bearing upon Rāma's love for Sītā, which makes Rāma very miserable. Just then arrive Janaka and the Queen-mother at the scene, on hearing about the fight, and both of them faint away at the sight of the emaciated Rāma

Act VII-Vālmīki invites the residents of Ayodhyā, representatives of gods, Asuras, and other heavenly beings to witness a small drama written by him, dealing with the events subsequent to the abandonment of Sītā. Rāma, Lakṣmana, Kuśa, Lava and Candraketu are

among the audience. The drama represents how Bhāgīrathī and Pṛthvī took Sītā who had given birth to twin-boys, to the nether world, and later kept the boys under Vālmīki's guardianship They also declare that they consider themselves more holy owing to their association with Sītā. All are impressed with this and the drama comes to an end with Sītā disappearing into the earth, when Lakṣmana indignantly exclaims "Is this the *finale* of your story, (O) Revered Vālmīki". Vālmīki then stages a miracle. All witness the coming up of Sītā from the waters; Bhāgīrathī and Pṛthvī deliver her over to Arundhatī who rebukes the people of Ayodhyā for doubting Sītā's chastity. The whole audience with one voice welcomes Sītā, and Rāma is reunited with Sītā and his two sons. Thus all is well that ends well

(B) Sources of the Uttararamacarita

As in the case of the *Mahāvīracarita*, Bhavabhūti closely follows the Rāmāyana story, as given by Vālmīki, in the *Uttararāmacarita*, with some changes dictated by the exigencies of dramatic representation (He may have been aware of different versions of the Rāma-story in the *Purāṇas* as well). Thus—

(1) Bhavabhūti introduces in the *Uttara* some-new characters such as the Nata (actor) residing in Ayodhyā, the river-Deities Tamasā and Muralā, the sylvan Deity Vāsantī, Ātreyī (the lady-student studying philosophy), the two pupils of Vālmīki, Saudhātakī and Bhāndāyana, Vidyādhara and Vidyādharī etc.

These do not in any way affect the story proper in the *Rāmāyaṇa*.

(2) Some new episodes are introduced—

The meeting of Rāma with the invisible Sītā (Act III); the Citradarśana (Act I), the duel between Lava and Candraketu and Rāma's intervention (Acts V and VI), the arrival of Janaka, Kausalyā, Vasiṣṭha and Arundhatī to stay at Vālmīki's hermitage (Act-IV)

These also do not appear to be in disharmony with the Rāma-story.

(3) The Śambūka episode and Śatrughna's departure to exterminate Lavana are described as happening not at the time mentioned in the *Rāmāyaṇa.*

(4) Śāntā is described by Bhavabhūti as the daughter of Daśaratha, according to the *Rāmāyaṇa*, she is the daughter of Romapāda

(5) The Garbha-Nāṭaka (Act VII) is an invention of the poet—

These are, after all, minor changes. The one important change that Bhavabhūti deliberately makes is as regards the ending of the drama. In the last verse (Act VII) Bhavabhūti tells us that the Rāma-story appears in his drama in a changed form[36]. Ignoring the tragic end in the *Rāmāyaṇa,* Bhavabhūti describes Sītā's re-union with Rāma, which according to him ought to be the proper Kāvyārtha Bhavabhūti need not be understood to have made this change entirely on his own. The *Padmapurāṇa* (Pātālakhaṇḍa) does refer to this version of the *Rāmāyaṇa* (According to the *Padma,* the Aśvamedha horse was guarded by Puṣkala, son of Bharata). The *Nāṭyaśāstra* does not countenance a tragic end for a drama. This was an additional reason why Bhavabhūti preferred a Purāṇa-version.

36 अभिनयैर्विन्यस्तरूपा (*Uttara* VII 20)

Bhavabhūti is certainly indebted to Kālidāsa's works, as regards the introduction of some episodes, with their bearing on the construction of the plot in the *Uttara* Bhavabhūti, as has been already remarked, deliberately challenges comparison with Kālidāsa, as is clear from Act IX in *Mālatī* which is modelled on Kālidāsa's *Vikrama*, Act IV.

As far as the *Uttara* is concerned, the following points should be noted —

(1) The Citradarśana-episode was undoubtedly suggested by *Raghuvaṃśa* XV 25- (तयोर्यथाप्रार्थितमिन्द्रियार्थानासेदुषो सद्मसु चित्रवत्सु । प्राप्तानि दु खान्यपि दण्डकेषु सचिन्त्यमानानि सुखान्यभूवन् ॥)

Most of the episodes directly mentioned by Kālidāsa in the Rāma-Cantos are referred to by Bhavabhūti.

(2) The beautiful message sent to Rāma by Sītā (*Raghu* XIV. 61-67) furnishes Bhavabhūti with many ideas and expressions for being incorporated in the *Uttara*

(3) Rāma's conviction that Kuśa and Lava were his sons has its counterpart in *S'āk VII* (Bhavabhūti elaborates the mental process, while Kālidāsa leaves the reader to draw his own conclusions from the facts mentioned).

(4) The reference to Bharata, the Garbhanāṭaka (Act VII) being represented by the Apsarases etc ,— all this is borrowed from the *Vikram*

(5) Apparently Bhavabhūti thought that Duhsanta's remorse was not properly described by Kālidāsa(*S āk* Act VI), so he takes particular care to describe Rāma's grief in great detail. (It must be remembered,

however, that Duhsanta had enjoyed his married life with Śakuntalā for just a fortnight or so, while Rāma was with Sītā for certainly more than fifteen years before he abandoned her)

(6) The part played by Astāvakra (Act I) in bringing the two messages, one about the urgent necessity of fulfilling the pregnancy-longing of Sītā and the other viz. the duty of the King towards his subjects, which dominate the *Uttara*, is suggested by the part of Vaikhānasa (*S'āk* Act I) who in a few words gives an amount of information directly bearing on the development of the plot in the *S'ākuntala.*

(7) Rāma is brought back to a sense of duty, when deeply distressed, by the arrival of the sages crying for help (Act I), Duhsanta is also described by Kālidāsa as giving up his mood of depression when Mātali comes to ask for his help on behalf of Indra (*S'āk* Act VI).

(8) Bhavabhūti makes Janaka (corresponding to Kanva in the *S'ākuntala*) an important character and describes his inmost thoughts. He apparently thought that Kālidāsa had not done sufficient justice to Kaṇva and had missed the opportunity to tell his readers what the father of an outraged daughter should feel

(9) Kālidāsa makes Sānumatī (Śakuntalā's friend) witness Duhsanta's grief due to remorse (*S'āk* Act VI), herself remaining invisible Bhavabhūti makes the heroine Sītā herself an eye-witness to the hero's grief (Act III).

Similarities of expression and ideas between Kālidāsa and Bhavabhūti are referred to in Lecture IV.

(C) A Critical Appreciation

When a dramatist takes upon himself the task of dramatising the career of a king, it is impossible for him to stick to the unity of Time which, strictly speaking, requires a play not to cover more than a period of twenty-four hours (according to the Greeks).

The plot of the *Uttara* extends over a period of twelve years or more, the interval between Act I and Act II being twelve years. The events described in Acts II-VII take only a few days (In the *Mahāvīra*, the plot extends over a period of at least fifteen years) Bhavabhūti, thus, does not attach much importance to the Unity of Time.

The Unity of Place, which requires the scenes to take place in the same locality, as far as possible, so as to make the plot more realistic, is likewise not observed in the *Uttara*. In Act I, the scene takes place at Rāma's palace at Ayodhyā; the events in Acts II and III, take place in the Dandaka forest near about Pañcav aṭī, hundreds of miles away from Ayodhyā. The events in the remaining Acts (IV-VII) take place near about the hermitage of Vālmīki, on the Ganges.

When we are dealing with the third Unity, the Unity of Action (or, Interest), we are confronted with a peculiar situation (which is not normally present in dramas) We have first to make sure whether there is any 'action' in the proper sense of the term in the *Uttara* In fact, it is possible to argue with reason that there is no 'action' in the play at all.

Thus—

In Act I, there is just a review of past incidents in Rāma's career which gives the poet an opportunity

to describe at length the working of the mind of Rāma The entry of the C I D Chief Durmukha who brings the news of the scandal about Sītā, spreading among the people, and the resolve of Rāma to abandon Sīta are the only two incidents which substantially add to the development of the plot.

In Act II, the opening scene gives information about the happenings during the interval of twelve years. In the main scene, the killing of Śambūka is the only event that takes place, the rest of the Act teeming with monotonous (and to a certain extent irrelevant), unwanted descriptions of the Dandaka region.

In Act III, there is the meeting of the invisible Sītā and Rāma; but whatever might be said about the poet's great success in describing the feelings of Rāma and Sītā in the extra-ordinary set up, nothing actually happens excepting the too many faintings and revivings of both the hero and the heroine.

In Act IV, there is similarly a description of the feelings of Janaka, Kausalyā and others on seeing Lava. The only event happening is the arrival of the Aśvamedha horse.

In Act V, the meeting of Lava and Candraketu (both being attracted to each other) takes place but nothing actually happens.

In Act VI, the duel between Lava and Candraketu takes place and Rāma succeeds in putting an end to the fight; this gives the poet another opportunity to describe Rāma's feelings in the self-same tiresome manner.

In Act VII, there is a drama within the drama and the poet wants his readers seriously to believe that the residents of Ayodhyā were quite satisfied about Sītā's chastity by witnessing the drama and hearing the rebuke administered to them by Arundhatī! One might as well ask, if the matter was so simple, why did not Arundhatī address the doubting Thomases in Ayodhyā before? That she was attending the Twelve-year sacrifice is a very lame excuse and the poet's attempt to convince the people by the Garbha-nātaka representation appears to be more or less ridiculous.

We think, therefore, that it is fair to admit that the *Uttara* has no plot as such As compared with the *Mālatīmādhava* which contains a main plot skilfully woven with a subordinate plot with plenty of incidents occurring in rapid succession, the *Uttara* appears to be quite tame Obviously, the poet wants the reader to look upon the *Uttara* as a dramatic poem, rather than a drama, and it is safe to proceed on that basis and to criticise the play from that point of view.

It must be made clear at the same time that Bhavabhūti has succeeded remarkably well in placing the main idea in the play always before the reader and in sustaining his interest throughout. In short, if the Unity of Action is absent, the Unity of Interest is maintained satisfactorily.

We now proceed to offer an appreciation of the *Uttara*, Act by Act :—

(Act I) — Like Act I of the *S'ākuntala*, Act I of the *Uttara* can be unreservedly regarded as almost perfect. The Bīja of the plot of the abandonment of

Sītā is very skilfully introduced through the conversation of the Sūtradhāra and the Actor of Ayodhyā in the opening scene. All the important factors that are to be made use of in the later Acts for the purpose of the development or clarification of the main theme are very cleverly introduced in the main scene, without the reader being made conscious of the same—as for instance, the Jṛmbhaka missiles, the advice of the Queen-mothers to fulfil Sītā's pregnancy-longing, Vasiṣtha's emphasis on the duty of Rāma to please his subjects, Rāma's prayer to Bhāgīrathtī and Pṛthvī to look after Sītā, etc The Citra-darśana programme is also skilfully availed of to describe Rāma's magnanimity, modesty, sense of gratitude etc The happy married life of Rāma and Sītā, with their musings over past incidents and associations, is described in unforgettable words, so also the terrible catastrophe, coming as it does when Rāma considers himself at the pinnacle of happiness, to blast his whole life all of a sudden. The reader finds himself completely overwhelmed with such a course of events, and is ready to share Rāma's grief. Bhavabhūti has undoubtedly shown himself at his best in this Act. His description of mature love[37] between husband and wife, can hardly be bettered No Sanskrit poet has described the joys of a happy married life in such a captivating manner.

(Act II)-After reaching the heights of perfection in Act I, Bhavabhūti has definitely gone down in this Act, and shows signs of losing his sense of proportion. The Viskambhaka scene where Ātreyī and Vāsantī meet, does give some useful information (the wonderful twins and their proficiency in studies, and

---

37. अद्वैत सुखदु खयो (I–39).

Vālmīki's new work, the *Rāmāyana* , but it is much too long. In the main scene there follows a tedious description of the Daṇḍaka forest. Rāma may be excused if he dilates upon the various regions which bring back to his mind his former associations there, but the new Avatāra of Śambūka also is made by the poet to join in the game of producing irrelevant descriptions Whole verses are bodily reproduced here from his other works by the poet (some of the passages are, it must be admitted, very poetic indeed)

(Act III)— Bhavabhūti obviously thinks very highly of his performance in this Act. Referring to the extra-ordinary situation described here viz. the meeting of Rāma with the invisible Sītā, he says 'What a wonderful state of things[38] !' The famous verse, Ekorasah Karuna eva nimittabhedāt-(III 47) also occurs in this Act where Bhavabhūti emphasises that the sentiment of pathos should be the one ruling sentiment in a drama (or life), and the other sentiments like Vīra, Hāsya, Harsa etc , serve as handmaids to glorify and accentuate the Karuna-rasa Bhavabhūti is also right when he says[39] that even the stones wept at his description of Rāma's poignant grief, but it cannot be gainsaid that the reader ultimately feels that he is living in a dream-land and the matter is really beyond him Again, the frantic activity, after a lapse of twelve years, of the river-Deities and Pṛthivī in bringing about the meeting between Rāma and Sītā is described as being motivated by their anxiety to see that Rāma does not die of shock. This is hardly a sufficiently

---

38 अहो, सविधानकम् (A similar expression occurs also in the *Mālatīmādhava* VI 13 3 , *Uttara* III 46.6)

39 अपि ग्रावा रोदित्यपि दऌति वज्रस्य हृदयम् (I 28)

convincing reason. In the *S'ākuntala* Kālidāsa describes Indra and the gods as being actively interested in the reunion of Duhsanta and Śakuntalā, only when the curse of Durvāsas comes to an end after the ring is found. It might be argued that the twelve-year sacrifice of Ṛsyaśrnga came in the way of the parties concerned not being active before, but no reason is given why that was necessary All the same, Bhavabhūti has succeeded in describing accurately, the emotions and repercussions arising in the minds of both Rāma and Sītā in a *telling* manner

(Act IV)—The Introductory scene here is perhaps the finest in the whole range of Sanskrit literature For once, the serious Bhavabhūti shows himself to be a humourist of a high order The students of Bhavabhūti's times do not appear to be in any way different from their counter-parts in modern times. There is in evidence the same spirit of rejoicing at the announcement of a holiday, the same innocent derision of the elders and so forth In the Main scene, Janaka typifies the father whose daughter has been ill-treated by the son-in-law, willing to strike but afraid to wound. The ideal relations between Janaka, Daśaratha and Kausalyā are beautifully portrayed. No one ean surpass Bhavabhūti in his admiration for a happy family life in all its aspects. Lava is described as an ideal Ksatriya, too proud to submit to any one and ever willing to defy the world.

(Act V)—The first impressions of Lava and Candraketu on seeing each other are described in a natural and charming manner. Lava's reference to the weak points in Rāma's career (Lava does not know that Rāma is his own father) is particularly happy.

(Act VI)—The duel between Lava and Candraketu is described in an exaggerated manner While the effect produced on Rāma's mind by the sight of both Kuśa and Lava (Kuśa is shown to be even naughtier and more defiant, and therefore, more lovable than Lava) is described in an artistic manner, there is unnecessary repetition of ideas Rāma is actually made to summarise the evidence(presumably for the benefit of a dull reader) which leads him to suspect that Kuśa and Lava were his own sons Kālidāsa, on the other hand, when faced with a similar problem in *S'āk* VII, throws out hints here and there, leaving the reader to draw his own conclusions The competition between Kuśa and Lava to parade their knowledge about *Rāmāyana*, and their recitation of some passages therein (without knowing their implications, which makes Rāma more miserable) is described in an attractive way

(Act VII)—This is perhaps the tamest Act in the play. While the idea of a Garbha-nātaka cannot be objected to, the reader fails to see how a mere representation on the stage of several episodes, could have convinced the audience of the truth Those who were prepared to believe in the testimony of Vālmīki or Arundhatī could have certainly done so, without the artificial machinery used here, for others, the whole thing would appear as a fairy tale. There are various signs of the Act being written in a hurry, with a desire to bring the play to a conclusion, somehow depicting a happy ending.

It would be clear from the above comments that Bhavabhūti is not much interested in the development of the plot in the play. As a matter of fact, there is not

much scope for such a development, the theme being much restricted by its very nature. It appears at first sight that the central theme is the abandonment of Sītā, and the subsequent reunion of Rāma and Sītā. But throughout the play right up to the end, excuses are being set forth now and then, to justify or to account for Rāma's conduct. Thus we are told that 1) Rāma was a young inexperienced king, (2) there were no elders by his side to give him proper advice at that time; (3) Rāma took the decision in his enthusiasm to strike the peoples' fancy and so forth This is not at all convincing. Vasistha had categorically advised Rāma that his supreme duty as King lay in pleasing the subjects and Rāma in his reaction to the message of Vasistha says that he would be ready to sacrifice gladly, even Sītā, to please his subjects,[40] and Sītā agrees with Rāma[41]. The decision was thus Rāma's own and the presence of the elders by his side would hardly have made any difference.

It seems that the reunion of Sītā and Rāma could not have been brought about by any one. The Garbha-nātaka ends with the disappearance of Sītā into the earth. To Laksmana's indignant query—'O Revered Vālmīki, is that the ending of your poem ?'[42], the proper answer, is — 'Certainly, that is the logical ending of the Kāvya' Rāma himself pathetically admits that the stigma on Sītā's character must last till her death[43] Bhavhbhūti has failed to show any convincing reason about the

40 स्नेह दया च सौख्य च यदि वा जानकीमपि ।
आराधनाय लोकाना मुञ्चतो नास्ति मे व्यथा ॥ (I. 12).

41 [अत एव राघवकुलधुरन्धर आर्यपुत्र] I 12.I

42 भगवन्वाल्मीके, एष ते काव्यार्थ ? VII 15 13.

43 एष ते जीवितावधि प्रवाद I 13 1

reunion being inevitable In the case of the *Mṛccha-kaṭika*, if Vasantasenā had been a second too late in reaching the place of execution, Cārudatta would have been hanged, Vasantasenā, Dhūtā and Maitreya would have committed suicide (No one would have liked such a tragic end, the audience would have possibly torn the author to pieces if he had made the *Mṛcchakaṭika* a tragedy). But it was entirely within the power of the poet, and in the realm of possibility to make Vasantasenā reach her destination in the nick of time and the tragedy was successfully averted. But in the *Uttara*, no such recourse could be availed of

If then, there is in the *Uttara*, no plot worth the name, no development of what little plot there is and no proper ending either, how is it that the play is acclaimed as one of the finest in Sanskrit literature[44], and what was the aim of the poet in writing the *Uttara* ? We may attempt to answer the above queries somewhat on the following lines — Bhavabhūti's main object in writing the *Uttara* is to give his readers an accurate picture of a happy married life, and to show how true love between a married couple is able to sustain the parties concerned in the most adverse circumstances. Kālidāsa in his *S'ākuntala* gives a warning to maidens that they should not fall a prey to momentary passion, for, a false step taken in haste may lead to disastrous consequences, making it difficult for them to attain to the coveted position of an ideal Gṛhiṇī, 'The Lady of the House.' Bhavabhūti begins where Kālidāsa ends. He describes how charming an ideal family life can be;

44 उत्तरे रामचरिते भवभूतिर्विशिष्यते-See the paper published in the Baroda Oriental Institute Quarterly (March 1952) by R. D. Karmarkar

how the husband and wife can derive the utmost pleasure in even remembering past incidents which had been shared by them for better or for worse; how true love can exist without sexual attraction and how it is heightened by the children who are the strongest tie binding the parents, and how the parents are enabled to out-wit the vagaries of Fate by steadfast devotion to each other. It is on this supposition about Bhavabhūti's aim, that one can understand the significance of the repeated references to past happenings and their repercussions on the minds of Rāma and Sītā, described in the play. It may appear that Bhavabhūti is wasting his time in converting the converted, when he describes the steadfast devotion of Rāma and Sītā, for, no one doubts that, and both Rāma and Sītā are also convinced about it. Where was then the necessity for dilating upon it again and again? This is done probably to bring home to the reader that nothing matters in the case of true lovers, provided they know that their faith in each other remains unshaken. When Sītā knows that Rāma had taken for his Sahadharmacāriṇī, her own image at the Aśvamedha sacrifice, she says that the dart[45] of grief due to her abandonment had been completely uprooted by Rāma from her heart by that action of his—All this has been described by the poet in a poetic manner and so, the *Uttara* can be rightly called a dramatic poem, rather than a drama.

The *Uttara* is sometimes credited with being a pre-eminently psychological play. This is hardly correct, for the need for a psychological analysis arises where some explanation is needed to bring out the proper significance of some emotion There is no such nece-

45 [अहो, उत्खातमिदानी मे परित्यागशल्यमार्यपुत्रेण ।] III 45 19.

ssity felt in the *Uttara* The minds of both Rāma and Sītā are an open book, and their reactions are not difficult to understand and require no elaboration

In Act III 47,[46] Bhāvabhūti describes the sentiment of pathos (Karuna) as the main or important sentiment dominating all other sentiments which are helpful in heightening the Karuna sentiment This can not be said to be true in respect of all poetical compositions. It fits in with the episodes in the *Uttara* Thus the Srngāra sentiment in Act I, by way of contrast heightens the Karuna in Act III, the Hāsya sentiment in the Prelude to Act IV, where the elders like Janaka and Vasistha are described in a funny manner convinces the reader of the terrible agony suffered by them. Likewise, the Vīra, Bhayānaka and Adbhuta sentiments portrayed in Acts V and VI in connection with the duel between Lava and Candraketu, so also the Vātsalya sentiment in Act VI, ultimately heighten the Karuna But the Karuna sentiment cannot claim the monopoly of being the chief or the one sentiment everywhere In a heroic poem where the heroic sentiment predominates, other sentiments surely contribute in their own way to the importance of the Vīra sentiment. Perhaps, because the Karuna sentiment is the one sentiment that affects a large part of the audience more easily, Bhavabhūti gives it an exalted position.

We shall now turn to another important topic in connection with the *Uttara* How far was Rāma to blame in his decision to abandon Sītā? It is generally assumed that Rāma acted unjustly towards Sītā, and Bhavabhūti being of the same opinion could do nothing

---

46. एको रस करुण एव

else than offering several excuses in extenuation of Rāma's action It appears to us that the main point on which our attention should be focussed is— Was there any alternative open to Rāma which he could have followed ? A proper answer to this query would make Rāma's position clear. The only alternative that could be thought of is that Rāma could have abdicated and chosen to remain as a commoner with Sītā as his wife (It is doubtful whether Rāma would have been allowed to remain in peace even as a commoner with Sītā publicly denounced as unchaste) We think that Rāma was not free to adopt such a course. He had been just crowned and the people with one voice had accepted him as their King. There, however, soon started a whispering campaign in Ayodhyā, doubting the chastity of Sītā, and the general consensus of opinion in Ayodhyā was that Sītā was not above suspicion and so, she could not possibly play the role of the First Lady of the Realm. Rāma had already solemnly promised to be the King, and he could not go back upon that The people of Ayodhyā emphatically wanted him to be their ruler. Therefore, there could be no question of Rāma's abdication The people of Ayodhyā had prima facie grounds for refusing to recognise Sītā as their Queen, and Rāma, pledged as he was to stick to Prajānām anurañjanam, had to yield. But how far is such appeasement to be allowed to encroach upon the rights of Rāma as an individual ? Would Rāma have yielded if the people of Ayodhyā had insisted upon Rāma's marrying again ? Possibly not. But the question never arose as the Ayodhyāites do not appear to be altogether unreasonable people. Any way they left Rāma free to do as he liked, once he had given up Sītā. Thus, there was really no alternative before

Rāma who had placed public good and honour of the Solar race above anything else.

It would be interesting to compare the case of Rāma, with that of Edward VIII of Great Britain, who, faced with a similar situation in 1936, chose to abdicate It is curious to note that they took different courses, but with the same aim in view. Both took the decision of their life on their own. Rāma had called his brothers to a conference, simply to announce his decision, not to hold a debate on it Edward VIII heard views from various quarters, but the ultimate decision was entirely his Rāma gave up Sītā in order that he might have the backing of his people in the discharge of his duties as King, Edward gave up his throne, frankly stating that he could not do full justice to his duties as King if he had not the lady whom he loved by his side as Queen Edward had an alternative open to him, but Rāma had not Both sacrificed at the altar of public good, one his personal feelings, the other worldly power Both gained in stature by the decision taken by them—this much is quite certain, though it is too early to judge of Edward's conduct and only posterity would be in a position to give a fair and balanced verdict thereon

The following extracts from Edward's farewell speech to his people after he had abdicated, are worth quoting —

" You all know the reasons which have impelled me to renounce the throne, but I want you to understand that in making up my mind, I did not forget the country or the Empire, which as Prince of Wales and lately as King, I have for twenty-five years tried to serve

But you must believe me when I tell you that I have found it impossible to carry the heavy burden of responsibility and discharge my duties as King as I would wish to do without help and support of the woman I love.

And I want you to know that the decision I have made has been mine and mine alone. This was a thing I had to judge entirely for myself ..

I have made this, the most serious decision of my life, only upon a single thought— of what in the end be best for all ”

There is no doubt that if Rāma had issued a proclamation after his decision, it would have been almost on the above lines, *mutatis mutandis* It would be uncharitable to subject to close scrutiny decisions of great men, in times of crisis, who after all have got to regard intuition as their best guide.

The whole atmosphere in the *Uttara* is serious and on an elevated plane. There is no Vidūsaka here (also in the other two plays), and even the majority of women-characters speak Sanskrit; and the style also is suited to the sense. Bhavabhūti's chief defect viz. the lack of a sense of proportion, and love for parading his scholarship and the use of obscure words— all this is well kept under control in the *Uttara*.

LECTURE IV

(A) Bhavabhūti's Scholarship

Bhavabhūti was, no doubt, a very learned man, and what is more, he delights in parading his knowledge, wherever possible A Puritan by conviction, he holds firm views about the orthodox tenets of the Śāstras, and is well grounded in the various lores Thus—

(1) Bred and brought up in a family of pious Brāhmana ancestors who had performed even the Vājapeya sacrifice,Bhavabhūti believes in the Pūrva-mīmāmsā cult of sacrifices with heaven as its goal, and in the daily observance of fire-worship by the house-holders[47] He believes in the efficacy of Tapas and performance of vows like Parāka, Sāntapana[48] He uses the expression Arthavāda in *Uttara* I, which is frequently used in the Pūrvamīmāmsā texts, and in *Mahāvīra* I, 'Ambuni majjantyalābūni grāvānah plavante, ' which is probably borrowed from the Śabara-bhāsya on the Mīmāmsā-sūtras

(2) He was well-versed in the Vedas and the Upaniṣads,Sānkhya and Yoga systems of philosophy.[49] He gives the impression of having studied the Yoga-

---

47. किं त्वनुष्ठाननित्यत्वं स्वातन्त्र्यमपकर्षति ।
सकटा ह्याहिताग्नीना प्रत्यवायैर्गृहस्थता ॥ (*Uttara* I 8)

48. *Uttara* IV. 3 1

48 In the verse यद्वेदाध्ययन तथोपनिषदा साङ्ख्यस्य योगस्य च
ज्ञान (*Mālatī* I 9)
the poet implies that he has this grounding, but in addition he knows what a successful dramatist should have (*Mahāvīra* Act III pp 87-88)- चित्तप्रसादनीश्चतस्रो मैत्र्यादिभावना ।

Śāstra and Tāntric literature of the Saiva sects as well. In *Mālatī* (Act V) he describes the journey through air of Kapālakundalā and the orgies of the Kāpālika Aghoraghanta (there were also some good Kāpālikas like Saudāminī, Acts IX and X). He uses the expression Vivarta (a peculiar concept in the Vedānta philosophy) twice in the *Uttara*.[50] It is, however, doubtful whether the word denotes there the doctrine of Māyā expounded later by Śaṅkarācārya There is constant reference to the three qualities—Sattva, Rajas and Tamas (expounded in the Sāṅkhya philosophy) in the three plays

(3) Bhavabhūti's acquaintance with the Nyāya-sūtras is clearly seen in *Mālatī* V[51], where the expressions, Samskāra, Pratyaya, Smṛti etc. are used in their technical sense. According to one commentator, the verse 'Līleva' etc ,[52] refers to the Sānkhya, Yogācāra, Sautrāntika, Tridandi, Pātañjala, Naiyāyika and Vijñānavāda doctrines[53] The expre-

---

50 एको रस करुण एव विवर्तभदात् (III 47)
ब्रह्मणीव विवर्तिना क्वापि विप्रलय कृत । (VI 10)

51 यत्सत्यमधुना तत्सदर्शनेनातिस्वल्पोऽपि न विशेष चैतन्यम् etc ,

52 लीलेव प्रतिबिम्बितेव (V. 10).

53 Jagaddhara says :–

(1) लीनत्व तदात्मतया सबद्धत्वम् । विषयविषयिणोस्तदात्मरूप एव सबन्ध इति योगाचारमतेनोक्तम् ।

(2) प्रतिबिम्बितेवेति साङ्ख्यमतोपदर्शनम् ।

(3) लिखितेवेति सौत्रान्तिकमतोपदर्शनम् ।

(4) उत्कीर्णरूपेवेति विषयाकारेण चैतन्यपरिणाम इहोत्कीर्णरूपता । अत.,
त्रिदण्डिमतम् ।

(5) प्रत्युप्तेवेति पातञ्जलमतम् ।

(6) वज्रलेपघटितेवेति नैयायिकमतम् ।

(7) अन्तर्निखातेवेति विज्ञानवादिमतोपदर्शनम् ।

ssion निगृहीतोऽस्मि in *Uttara* IV, reminds one of 'Nigraha-sthāna' in the Nyāya philosophy

(4) Kāmasūtra is actually quoted (*Mālatī* VII)[54] and the remedies resorted to by Kāmandakī to prepare the minds of Mālatī and Madayantikā for a stolen marriage follow closely the lines laid down in the Kāmasūtras.

(5) The very name Kāmandakī of a character in *Mālatī* betrays the poet's acquaintance with the *Nītisāra* attributed to Kāmandaka. The schemes and strategy of Mālyavat in *Mahāvīra* (Act IV) are in accordance with the *Arthaśāstra* of Cāṇakya, and such other works.

(6) The poet must have been also closely acquainted with the *Bṛhatkathā* of Gunādhya (from which several incidents in *Mālatī* are borrowed) and the Purāna literature

(7) He was well-versed in the *Rāmāyana* story, curiously enough, the characters in the *Mahābhārata* are not much in evidence

(8) He makes use of a large number of Alamkāras in his plays and is fully conversant with Rhetorics.

(9) He uses a large number of metres and knows the science of Prosody very well. He uses the longest Daṇḍaka metre (54 letters in a quarter) with great effect in describing the goddess Cāmuṇḍā in *Mālatī* (Act V).

---

54 कुसुमसधर्माणो हि योषित सुकुमारोपक्रमा । तास्वनधिगतविश्वासै प्रसभमुपक्रम्यमाणा सद्य सप्रयोगविद्वेषिण्यो भवन्ति । —एव किल कामसूत्रकारा आमनन्ति ।

Jagaddhara also says- कथाकथन तु रागवृद्धये ।

यदाह—यात्रा पुरस्कन्दनमुत्सवो वा स्वप्नोऽथ चित्र रतिसकथा च ।

भवन्त्युपाया प्रथमावलोके यूनोर्यतो वृद्धिमुपैति राग ।।

(10) He is the only Sanskrit poet who gives two verses which read the same in Sanskrit as well as Prakrit[55]. He uses many an out-of-the way words and expressions, thus showing that he commands an extensive vocabulary He has also introduced situations where the same verse or expression is addressed by two, three or even more characters to two different persons, or to one and the same person Similarly a verse is split up into different portions that are uttered by different people[56]

(11) The accurate description of Padmāvatī (*Māl* Act IX), the Dandaka region (*Mahāvīra* and *Uttara)*, rivers etc, points out to the poet's own impressions in these matters

(B) Bhavabhūti's debt to Kālidāsa

Sanskrit dramatists have normally to work under a great handicap, due to their tendency to follow strictly the rules laid down in Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra* as regards the characters in the play, or the incidents to be depicted on the stage etc The Rhetoricians also impose

---

55 सरले साहसराग परिहर रम्भोरु मुञ्च सरम्भम् ।
विरस विरहायास सोढु तव चित्तमसह मे ।
किवा भणामि विच्छेददारुणायासकारिणि ।
काम कुरु वरारोहे देहि मे परिरम्भणम् ॥ (*Mālatī* VI 10 11)

56 *Mahāvīra* :

Act I (कन्ये) P 10, 16, 17, 22, 27, (सीतोर्मिले) 29, 33, 35, 41, 42
(कुमारौ, तौ) रामलक्ष्मणौ P 14, 15, 18, 22, 23, 42, 43,

Act II (सख्य) 56, 57, 58, 60, 61, 69, 71, 72, 75, (स्त्रिय) 68, (जनकशतानन्दौ) 80, 81, (इतरे) 82

Act III (वसिष्ठविश्वामित्रौ) 84,145,147, (जनकदशरथविश्वामित्रा) 110, (राजानौ) 139, 146, (सर्वे) 139, 155, (ऋषय) 147, (युधाजिद्रूरतौ) 153, (रामलक्ष्मणौ) 155, (इतरे) 186.

(Continued on page 72)

on them certain conventions regading the use of Alamkāras and the language to be used by the several characters. In these circumstances, it is only to be expected that very many expressions, ideas and situations in different dramas are more or less common, and no definite conclusion can be drawn as to the borrowing from some one The case of Kālidāsa and Bhavabhūti stands on a different footing There is reason to believe that Bhavabhūti deliberately wanted to imitate Kālidāsa to show to the world that he could beat Kālidāsa on his own ground. In order to understand Bhavabhūti's position better we give here some of the important similarities found in the works of the two poets

---

(Continued from page 71)

Mālatī

Act I (उभौ) P 29, (उभे) P 41, 42

Act III (कामन्दकीमाधवौ) P 73, (splitting up the verse) (इतरा) P 73, 74, (सर्वा) P 72

Act IV (इतरा) P 75, 76

Act V (कापालिकौ) P 99, (माधवाघोरघण्टौ) P 105 (मालती-कपालकुण्डले प्रति) P 106 (अन्योन्यमुद्दिश्य)

Act VIII (मालत्यवलोकिते) P 158, (अवलोकितालवङ्गिकाबुद्धरक्षिता) P 159, (लवङ्गिकामदयन्तिके) P 166, (उभे) P 166, 168, (माधवमकरन्दौ) P. 166

Act IX (माधवमकरन्दौ) P 194, (उभौ) P 196

Act X (इतरे) P 198, (मदयन्तिकालवङ्गिके) P 203, 205, 208, 210, (कामन्दकीमकरन्दौ) P 203, 205, (इतरा) P 205, (माधवमकरन्दौ) P 207, 208, 209, 210, 213, (सर्वे) P. 212.

Uttara :

Act III (तमसावासन्त्यौ) P 97, (सीतारामौ प्रति) before III 48.

Act IV (अरुन्धतीजनकौ) P 115, 118, 123, (कुमारौ) P. 135, 136, (अन्योन्य प्रति) After V. 15.

Act VI (कुशलवौ) P 170

Act VII (देव्यौ) P. 174, 179, 180, 181, (रामलक्ष्मणौ) P 187, (कुशलवौ) P. 188.

Mālatīmādhava	(Kālidāsa)
I 5. दारानपत्याय	प्रजायै गृहमेधिनाम् (*Raghu* I 3)
I. 20 9 सचारिणीव	सचारिणी दीपशिखेव (*Raghu* VI. 67)
I. 21 सा रामणीयकनिधे- रधिदेवता वा etc	अस्या सर्गविधौ .(*Vikram* I 10) सर्वोपमाद्रव्यसमुच्चयेन (*Kumāra* I. 49) चित्रे निवेश्य . (*S'āk* II. 9)
I 29 यान्त्या मुहुर्वल्लितकन्धर	प्रियमाचरित लते (*Vikram* I 19) दर्भाङ्कुरेण क्षत . (*S'āk* II 12)
I 33 7 प्रसन्नप्रायस्ते तर्क	प्रसन्न तर्क (*Vikram* II) प्रसन्नतर्क भवन्त (*Mālavikā* III)
I 35 वारवार तिरयति	त्वामालिख्य प्रणयकुपिता (*Megha* 107) प्रजागरात् खिलीभूत (*S'āk* VI 22) न च सुवदनामालेख्येऽपि . (*Vikram* II. 10)
II 3 इय न कल्याणी रमयति- मन कम्पयति च	शोच्या च प्रियदर्शना च .. (*S'āk* III. 9)
II. 11 कटाक्षैर्नारीणा कुवलयित- वातायनमिव	तासा मुखै .. (*Raghu* VII. 21) . कुवलयितगवाक्षा लोचनैरङ्गनानाम् (*Raghu* XI. 93)
II 11 5 . कुतो वा महोदधि वर्जयित्वा पारिजातस्योद्गम	सागरमुज्झित्वा कुत्र वा महानद्यवतरति (*S'āk* III)
II 12 क्षिपन्निद्रामुद्रा विहगमिथुनाना ..	चक्रवाकवधू , आमन्त्रयस्व सहचरम् (*S'āk* III) रथाङ्गनाम्नोरिव .. (*Raghu* III. 24) ...चक्रवाकयो पुरो वियुक्ते मिथुने (*Kumāra* V. 26) सरसि नलिनीपत्रेण . विरौषि समुत्सुक ।(*Vikram* IV.39)
III. 7. घनराजिनूतनपयसमुक्षण- क्षणबद्धकुड्मलकदम्बडम्बर ।	त्वत्सपर्कात्पुलकित- मिव प्रौढपुष्पै कदम्बै । (*Megha* 25)
III 15 जितमिह भुवने त्वया यदस्या सखि बकुलावलि वल्लभासि जाता ।	वय तत्त्वान्वेषान्मधुकर हतास्त्व खलु कृती । (*S'āk* I. 21)

Ref.	Bhavabhūti	Parallel
IV. 3	विधि स्वास्थ्य धत्ता भवतु अवन्ध्यफलनीग्म कृतकृत्यश्च मदन ।	भवतु पञ्चबाग कृती। (*Vikram* II 11)
V 1	अविचलितमनोभि साधकैर्मृग्य-माण ।	अन्तर्यश्च मुमुक्षुभिर्निय-मितप्राणादिभिर्मृग्यते । (*Vikram* I 1)
VI 6	द्वयमवयवै पाण्डुक्षामैरलङ्कृत-मण्डना	आभरणस्याभरण (*Vikram* II 3)
VI. 7 43-44	मकरन्द – सखे श्रुतम्, माधव –श्रुतममृतो-षस्तु हृदयस्य	चित्रलेखा– [सखि श्रुत त्वया] उर्वशी– [श्रुत न पुन पर्याप्त हृदयस्य ।] (*Vikram* II)
VI 15-11	इयमशेषमामन्तमस्तको-त्तसपरागरञ्जितचरणाङ्गुले	सम्राजश्चरणयुग प्रस्थानप्रणतिभिरङ्गुलीषु चक्रुर्मौलिस्रक्च्युतमकरन्दरेणुगौरम् । (*Raghu* IV 88)
VI 16	प्रेयो मित्र बन्धुता वा समग्रा	गृहिणी सचिव सखी मिथ (*Raghu* VIII 67)
VII. 3	मनोरथसहस्रवृत	मनोरथशतैर्वृत (*Vikram* IV 37)
VIII 12	मम हि कुवलयाक्षी प्रत्यनिष्टैकबुद्धे	अतिस्नेह पापशङ्की (*S'āk* IV)
IX 17	घर्माम्भोविगमागमव्यतिकर-श्रीवाहिनो वासरा ।	नववारिधरोदयादहोभि-र्भवितव्य च निरातपत्वरम्यै । (*Vikram* IV 10)
IX. 24, 25	The reference to the cloud, प्रिय-सहचरी विद्युत् ।	(*Meghadūta*)
IX 25	सुरपतिधनुर्लक्ष्म लक्ष्मी तनोति ।	मलिनमपि हिमांशोर्लक्ष्म लक्ष्मी तनोति । (*S'āk* I 17) सुरपतिधनुश्चारुणा तोरणेन (*Megha* 77)
IX 26	आशातन्तुर्न च कथयतात्यन्त-मुच्छेदनीय । प्राणत्राण कथमपि करोत्यायताक्ष्या स एक ।।	आशाबन्ध कुसुमसदृश प्रायशो ह्यङ्गनाना सद्य पाति प्रणयिहृदय विप्रयोगे रुणद्धि । (*Megha* 10)
IX 27	नवेषु लोध्रप्रसवेषु कान्तिर्दृश.	श्यामास्वङ्ग (*Megha* 106) कलमन्यभृतासु भाषित (*Raghu* VIII 59)

IX 29 वयोवस्था तस्या शृणुत यत्र मदन प्रगल्भव्यापारश्चरति हृदि मुग्धश्च वपुषि ।	मुग्धत्वस्य च योवनस्य च सखे मध्ये मधुश्री स्थिता । (*Vıkram* II. 7)
IX 31 एष प्रियतमास्कन्धविश्रान्त-कर करी	एष नीपस्कन्धनिषण्णहस्त करिणीसहायो नागराजस्तिष्ठति । (*Vıkram* IV. 42)
IX 40 एको निवापसलिल पिबमित्ययुक्तम् ।	इति चापि विधाय दीयता सलिलस्याञ्जलिरेक एव नौ (*Kumāra* IV 37)
IX 42 भगवन् पौरस्त्यपवन, भ्रमय जलदानम्बोगर्भान्	भगवन् वसन्तप्रिय दक्षिणवायो, वासार्थ हर सभृत सुरभिणा . (*Vıkram* II 20)
IX 43 पासुना सह जीवित वह मम प्रिया यत । अथवा तदङ्गपरिवासशीतल मयि किञ्चिदर्पय	तामानय प्रियतमा मम वा समीप मा वा नयाशु यत्र कान्ता । (*Vıkram* IV. 25)
IX 53 व्यतिकर इव भीमस्तामसो वैद्युतश्च (also ın *Uttara*)	स्त्रीसस्थान ज्योतिरेक तिरोभूत् । (*S'āk* V. 30)
X 2 अनियतरुदित स्मित (also ın *Uttara* IV)	आलक्ष्यदन्तमुकुलाननिमित्तहासैरव्यक्तवर्ण-रमणीयवच प्रवृत्तीन् (*S'āk* VII 17)
X 13 को नाम पाकाभिमुखस्य जन्तो-र्द्वाराणि दैवस्य पिधातुमिष्टे	अथवा भवितव्याना द्वाराणि भवन्ति सर्वत्र (*S'āk* I)
X 22 अपि चिन्तामणिश्चिन्ता-परिश्रममपेक्षते	तव प्रसादस्य पुरस्तु सपद । (*S'āk* VII 30)

(शकुन्तला and दुष्यन्त, पुरूरवस् and उर्वशी, the Hero and Heroine ın *S'āk* and *Vıkram* are dırectly mentıoned in Act II and शाकुन्तलादीनितिहासवादान् occurs ın Act III , the expression यदि सोऽपि कदर्पजननी त्वा रुक्मिणीमिव पुरुषोत्तम ıs found ın Act IV. Kālidāsa's *Mālavıkā* countaıns a reference to शौरि and रुक्मिणी ın Act V.)

Uttararāmacarıta

I. 18-5 भार्गव epısode (*Raghu* XI. 58-88)

I. 23 पुत्रसङ्क्रान्तलक्ष्मीकैर्यद् वृद्धेक्ष्वाकुभिर्धृतम् । (also *Mahāvīra* IV. 51)	गुणवत्सुतरोपितश्रिय (*Raghu* VII 11) गलितवयसामिक्ष्वाकूणा (*Raghu* III. 70) · तरुमूलानि गृहीभवन्ति तेषा (*S'āk* VII 20)
I. 23-3 वट श्यामो नाम	(*Raghu* XIII. 53)
I 24-1 एष विन्ध्याटवीमुखे विरोधसरोध —	(*Raghu* XII. 28-30)
I. 24-4 [आर्यपुत्रहस्तधृतताल-वृन्तातपत्र]	स्वहस्तधृतदण्डम् आतपत्रम् । (*S'āk* V 6)
I. 25 वैखानसाश्रमतरूणि · नीवारमष्टि	(*S'āk* I)
I. 28 कनकहरिणच्छद्मविधिना	(*Raghu* XII 52)
I 30-11 दनुकबन्ध	(*Raghu* XII 57)
I 33 सोऽय शैल ककुभसुरभि	(*Raghu* XIII. 26)
I. 33-4 विस्मारिता वय महाराज-दशरथस्य रामभद्रेणेति	रघुमेव निवृत्तयौवन तममन्यन्त नवेश्वर प्रजा । (*Raghu* VIII 5)
II 2 प्रियप्राया वृत्तिर्विनयमसृणो वाचि नियम	भवतीना सूनृतयैव गिरा कृतमातिथ्यम् । (*S'āk* I)
II. 4 वितरति गुरु प्राज्ञे विद्या · प्रभवति शुचिर्बिम्बोद्ग्राहे मणिर्न मृदा चय ।	विनेतुरद्रव्यपरिग्रह एव बुद्धिलाघव प्रकटयति । (*Mālavikā* I) पात्रविशेषे न्यस्त गुणान्तर व्रजति शिल्पमाधातु । (*Mālavikā* I 6)
II 4-5 आकस्मिकप्रत्यवभासा च देवी वाच दैरयत् ।	निषादविद्धाण्डजदर्शनोत्थ श्लोकत्वमापद्यत यस्य शोक ॥ (*Raghu* XIV 70)
III 4 परिपाण्डुदुर्बलकपोलसुन्दर विरहव्यथेव वनमेति जानकी ।	वसने परिधूसरे वसाना मम दीर्घ विरहव्रत बिभर्ति । (*S'āk* VII 21)
III 17-18 एतेनापत्यस्मरणेनो-च्छ्वसितप्रस्नुतस्तनी	इय ते जननीप्राप्ता · स्नेहप्रस्नवनिर्भिन्नमुद्वहन्ती स्तनाशुकम् ॥ (*Vikram* V. 12)

Bhavabhūti	Kālidāsa
III 21 कदम्ब · प्रियतमया परिवर्धितोऽयमासीत्	कान्तया वर्धितो मे बालमन्दारवृक्ष (*Megha* 77)
III 23 सततमपि न स्वेच्छादृश्यो नवो नव एव य ।	सल्लिनिधिरिव नवो नवोऽयमक्ष्णो । (*Mālavikā* I 11)
III 45-16 हिरण्मयी सीताप्रतिकृति	तस्या एव प्रतिकृतिसखो यत्क्रतूनाजहार । (*Raghu* XIV. 87)
IV 4 अनियतरुदितस्मित	आलक्ष्यदन्तमुकुलाननिमित्तहासैरव्यक्तवर्णरमणीयवच प्रवृत्तीन् (*S'āk* VII 17)
IV. 8 दृष्टे जने प्रेयसि दु सहानि स्रोत सहस्रैरिव सप्लवन्ते ।	तमवेक्ष्य रुरोद सा · स्वजनस्य हि दु खमग्रतो विवृतद्वारमिवोपजायते । (*Kumāra* IV 26)
IV. 11 गुणा पूजास्थान गुणिषु न च लिङ्ग न च वय ।	पद हि सर्वत्र गुणैर्निधीयते । (*Raghu* III. 62) स्त्री पुमानित्यनास्थैषा वृत्त हि महित सताम् । (*Kumāra* VI 12)
IV. 17-7 अतिक्रान्तो मनोरथ	मनोरथा नाम तटप्रपाता । (*S'āk* VI 10)
IV 20-8 भिद्येत वा सद्वृत्तमीदृशस्य निर्माणस्य	न तादृशा आकृतिविशेषा गुणविरोधिनो भवन्ति (*S'āk* IV) आकृतिविशेषप्रत्ययादेनामनूनवस्तुका सभावयामि । (*Mālavikā* I)
IV 22-33 भरतस्तमप्सरोभि प्रयोजयिष्यतीति	मुनिना भरतेन य प्रयोग भवतीष्वष्टरसाश्रयो नियुक्त (*Vikram* II. 18)
V. 16 पुराणो वा जन्मान्तरनिबिडबद्ध परिचय ।	रम्याणि वीक्ष्य ·· तच्चेतसा स्मरति जननान्तरसौहृदानि । (*S'āk* V. 2) मनो हि जन्मान्तरसगतिज्ञम् । (*Raghu* VII. 15)
V. 27 ककुत्स्थस्येव ते मह	महेन्द्रमास्थाय महोक्षरूप (*Raghu* VI 72)
VI. 3 त्वाष्ट्रयन्त्रभ्रमिभ्रान्तमार्तण्ड·	आरोप्य चक्रभ्रममुष्णतेजास्त्वष्ट्रेव यत्नोल्लिखितो विभाति (*Raghu* VI. 32)

VII 1 गाज्यश्रमनिवासेऽपि प्राप्त- कष्टमुनिव्रत । — अध्याक्रान्ता वसतिरमुना पुण्य शब्दो मुनिरिति मुहु केवल राजपूर्व । (*S'ak* II 15)

VII 7-7 अनाथास्मि — निशाचरोपप्लुतभर्तृकाणा तपस्विनीना भूत्वा शरण्या शरणार्थमन्य कथ प्रपत्स्ये (*Raghu* XIV 64)

Mahāviracarita

I (P 14) आचार इति — आचार इत्यवहितेन (*S'āk* V 3)

I. (P. 23) कन्यायाश्च परार्थतैव — अर्थो हि कन्या परकीय एव (*S'āk* IV 22)

I (P 48) स्वस्ति महेन्द्रद्वीपात् — स्वस्ति (*Mālavikā* V)

IV 5 परितप्तो यदि वा घटेत — तप्तेन तप्तमयसा घटनाय योग्यम् । (*Vikram* II. 16)

IV (P 162) आत्मनातृतीयेन — आत्मनातृतीय (*S'āk*I)

[These and many more have been pointed out by us in our editions of Bhavabhūti's plays *Mālatī* (1935) and *Uttara* (1938)]

Some of the similarities perhaps can be explained as merely showing acquaintance with Kālidāsa's works, but Bhavabhūti no doubt has a desire to show that he has bettered the ideas of Kālidāsa in the process of borrowing. The whole scheme of his three dramas is apparently drawn with a view to scoring over Kālidāsa There is no positive evidence to support this, but a proud poet like Bhavabhūti could not have taken to imitating Kālidāsa, without any special purpose in view, and that purpose appears to be to show better method of treating the same topics which Kālidāsa has dealt with.

Thus—Kālidāsa in his *Mālavika* (I 4) had said that Kāvya should not be regarded as good, simply because it is old[57] (or so described in the Purānas), and

57 पुराणमित्येव न साधु सर्वम् ।
विरचितपद वीरप्रीत्या सुरोपमसूरिभि – (V 2)
भर्त्रासि वीरपत्नीना श्लघ्याया स्थपिता धुरि (V 16)

so he took for his hero in that drama a modern King, Agnimitra who is described as a Vīra by implication. Bhavabhūti evidently was annoyed with Kālidāsa's conception of a Vīra (Agnimitra, the much-married Hero in *Mālavikā* is usually regarded as an unheroic Hero), and wanted to show what a Vīra really ought to be by writing his *Mahāvīra* where he has used the word Vīra more than a hundred times and has designated some of the characters there as actually Mahāvīras (Paraśurāma, Jatāyus, Vālin etc).

To Bhavabhūti Kālidāsa seems to present a different conception of the Adbhuta element in the *Vikram.* There Kālidāsa describes a celestial nymph as falling in love with a king on the earth Bhavabhūti thinks that the Adbhutatva can be very well described, even though no supernatural agency is brought into action In the *Mālatī*, he shows the miraculous chain of events occurring not as the result of supernatural forces (The Kāpālikas were well-known as possessing Yogic powers and therefore able to move through the air and so forth) A poet, therefore, possessing a fertile imagination can produce an original plot by sticking to the events possible on the earth itself, and Kālidāsa was not such a poet in Bhavabhūti's opinion.

Bhavabhūti appears to have considered Kālidāsa as being not bold enough to take liberties with the episodes in the epics and the Purānas In the *Uttararāmacarita*, Bhavabhūti introduces the happy ending, converts Janaka into a father who does not take the outrage upon his daughter meekly, and makes the deities work more actively to achieve the happy end Kālidāsa in his *S'ākuntala* allows matters to take their own course in a milder way Similarly, Bhavabhūti

wants to have a fling at Kālidāsa for not dropping the character of *Vidūsaka* in his plays

In short, Bhavabhūti would like his readers to believe that he was more bold and original than Kālidāsa, not at all afraid to break away from old traditions and conventions as regards the representation of a drama, if it suited him

Regarding the various episodes in the Rāma-story as described by Kālidāsa in his *Rāghu*, Bhavabhūti's contention probably is that he has successfully tried to bring out their implications clearly (e g the episodes of Paraśurāma, Mantharā, Jatāyus) which Kālidāsa has not pointed out. (As Kālidāsa was just giving a hurried description of the incidents, he had no occasion or intention to do so)

Regarding the description of Mādhava's madness in *Mālatī* IX, Bhavabhūti thinks that he has improved upon a similar scene in *Vikram* IV, by providing a foil to Madhava, in Makaranda who, by his observations on Mādhava's condition now and then, heightens the total effect. Similarly, the detailed manner in which Rāma is made to analyse the evidence in support of the conclusion that Kuśa and Lava are his own sons (*Uttara* VI) is, according to Bhavabhūti, a distinct improvement upon what Duhsanta does in *S'āk* VII, on a similar occasion. (It must, however, be confessed that Kālidāsa's treatment is more artistic than that of Bhavabhūti)

Bhavabhūti can, likewise, claim to have described the Srngāra and Karuna sentiments in his plays in an attractive manner as Kālidāsa has done But in addition, he has dealt with the Bhayānaka, Bībhatsa and Vīra sentiments also, (which Kālidāsa has not done,) ensuring at the same time that a high level of serenity is maintained throughout

From the few points stated above briefly, it seems clear that though opinions might differ as to whether Bhavabhūti has been able to prove that he has improved upon Kālidāsa, there is no doubt that he owes a great debt to Kālidāsa whom he wants to challenge again and again

(C) Chronological Order of Bhavabhūti's Plays

The question about the Chronological order of Bhavabhūti's plays would be discussed along the lines on which we have discussed the question of the Chronological order of Kālidāsa's works elsewhere.[58] Conclusions based upon internal evidence alone must be regarded as more or less tentative, though in the case of Sanskrit dramas which are generally stereotyped and are careful to follow old conventions and dicta, the position is comparatively easier One has usually to take note of the account about the poet in the Prologues, the hero and the heroine, the treatment of love (which is predominant in most Sanskrit dramas), the general atmosphere of the drama etc , in considering the present question

(1) The Account about the Poet in the Prologues —

Generally speaking, it is true that a poet gives a very detailed account about himself in his first work, as he is then introducing himself to his audience for the first time. There is no necessity for giving a detailed information in the later works, and the account is perhaps the scantiest in the last work

58 See 'Kālidāsa' by R D Karmarkar, Karnatak University Publication 1960
The reader should judge for himself whether the facts referred to in the three dramas show that the poet has improved them in the succeeding plays.

This is true in the case of Kālidāsa[59] for instance In the case of Harsa who also has three dramas (*Priya-darśikā, Ratnāvalī and Nāgānanda*) to his credit, there is just the same one verse in all the three dramas,[60] no detailed account being necessary in the case of the Royal poet

Applying the above criterion to Bhavabhūti's plays, we find that *Mahavīra* contains the longest account, and *Uttara* the shortest. Prima facie, therefore, this suggests that *Mahāvīra* was the first work and *Uttara* the last In the *Mālatī* Bhavabhūti adds a verse glorifying his ancestors still further,[61] presumably to mock at his critics who had disparaged his first work, but who at any rate could not boast of a glorious heritage

It has to be made clear at this stage that the first work of a poet is not necessarily the weakest; on the contrary it is found that the first work contains many a good point which is used to advantage in the later works, in the light of experience gained.

(2) The Hero and the Heroine--

In *Mahāvīra*, there are too many Heroes and the Heroine is almost a non-entity

In *Mālatī*, the number of Heroes is drastically reduced; the official Hero and Heroine are given due prominence; but the Subordinate plot runs almost parallel to the Main plot, and Makaranda and Madayantikā who are practically the Hero and Heroine there, have almost overshadowed Mādhava and Mālatī.

In *Uttara*, Rāma, the Hero, dominates throughout, and Sītā, the Heroine, is much in evidence.

---

59 See 'Kālidāsa' by R. D. Karmarkar

60. श्रीहर्षो निपुण कवि परिषदप्येषा गुणग्राहिणी etc.

61 ते श्रोत्रियास्तत्त्वविनिश्चयाय (*Mālatī* I 5).

(3) The Treatment of Love—

In *Mahāvīra*, the Vīra sentiment dominates so much that there is hardly any scope for the treatment of love as such, but Bhavabhūti makes it sufficiently clear that he believes in love at first sight as being the right kind of love which can be nursed when the parties concerned are not even in the teen-age.

In *Mālatī*, Bhavabhūti describes the love of a youthful couple, and refers to the obligations of the daughter to the father and the family, before plunging into love It is also pointed out that the love between husband and wife cannot be said to be complete unless it is strengthened by the love for children [62]

In *Uttara*, the poet gives a complete and arresting description of love between a married couple of long standing[63]— love which has culminated in the acme of affection (*snehasāra*) which has overcome all artificial barriers in course of time, which recognises children as the strong tie binding the husband and wife, and which endures in all circumstances, and which pays due respect to the constituent members of the family

(4) The General Atmosphere of the Play

In *Mahāvīra*, there is a noticeable absence of restraint, and almost all characters describe their emotions in an exaggerated manner Śatānanda, Janaka's Purohita, exceeds all bounds of propriety in hurling as many as ten abusive epithets at Paraśurāma, which would do credit to the fraternity at Billingsgate.

In *Mālatī*, generally a more restrained tone is in evidence Even the Kāpālikas do not indulge in abu-

62 अकारणस्मेरमनोहराननं (*Mālatī* X 6).

63 अद्वैतं सुखदुःखयो . (*Uttara* I, 39)

sive expressions. The poet, however, is more concerned with depicting Adbhtua episodes indiscriminately.

In *Uttara*, the whole atmosphere is dignified and serene. Even Janaka who had full justification to lose control of himself, shows admirable restraint [64] The element of humour in a subtle form is provided in the conversation between the two pupils, and Lava's sally at the weak points in Rāma's career (Act IV).

On reconsideration, Bhavabhūti seems to have come to the conclusion that he was wrong in tampering with the Rāmāyana story in the *Mahāvīra* regarding certain episodes unnecessarily and corrects himself accordingly He thus refers in the *Uttara*[65] to the despicable part played by Kaikeyī (the Madhyamā Ambā) and also to Rāma's killing of Vālin[66] by unfair means

[Bhavabhūti seems to have been purposely vague about the time when Sītā was actually sent into exile by Rāma, whether it was immediately after the coronation or after the expiry of several days or months Similarly Sītā is said to be Kathoragarbhā and also to have the pregnancy-longing in the play, but the poet is equally silent as to when Sītā's delivery took place. Bhavabhūti is possibly availing himself of the permissible dramatic device of postulating 'double time' for the drama. Anyway the poet has managed his theme in such a manner that the reader is scarcely aware of any discrepancies or improbability of certain events].

It is held by some that *Mahāvīra* was the last work of the poet, on the ground that it is available only in

---

64. He contents himself with saying, कोऽयमग्निर्नामास्मत्प्रसूतिशोधने (*Uttara* IV)

65 अये, मध्यमाम्बावृत्तमन्तरितमार्येण (Act I)

66. यद्वा कौशलमिन्द्रसूनुनिधने तत्राप्यभिज्ञो जन (Act V. 34)

an unfinished form and this was due to the death of the poet This is impossible because in that case, the famous verse where Bhavabhūti castigates his critics in *Mālatī* (I. 5) can have no locus standi, for, *Uttararāmacarita* could not have possibly preceded *Mālatī*, as no critic could have been foolish enough to condemn it outright To say that the first work must have been some work not as yet discovered, is to shirk the issue

Some think that the order of the works should be- *Mahāvīra*, *Uttara* and *Mālatī*—this would ensure that the two Rāma-plays were finished first and Bhavabhūti took to writing an original play after having done with the Rāma-story This view can not get rid of the difficulty pointed out above, viz. Bhavabhūti's outburst in the *Mālatī*, and secondly it is unthinkable that Bhavabhūti, after having described the glories of a full married life, which brings down, so to speak, heaven on the earth, should have thought of once again describing the pre-marriage court-ship of young lovers

We think that it would be reasonable to conclude that the order of the three plays should be–

(1) *Mahāvīracarita*,

(2) *Mālatīmādhava*,

(3) *Uttararāmacarita*

This accounts for the progressive development of the dramatic art and technique in the three plays, as also of the treatment of love in all its aspects The *Uttara* is certainly the last work of the poet, like the *S'ākuntala* of Kālidāsa, written when Bhavabhūti, rich in experience of worldly life, especially of family life, was in a position to portray accurately the constituent elements of a family in all its bearings. It is equally

certain that *Mahāvīra* is the first work There is thus no problem as such about the chronological order of the plays

(D) Bhavabhūti's Contribution to Sanskrit Literature and Indian Culture

Kālidāsa and Bhavabhūti can be regarded as true representatives who have contributed materially to make what Indian culture stands for. As is well-known, Indian culture and tradition attach great importance to the solidarity of the family and harmonious relations between the members of the family. Bhavabhūti appears to be just more outspoken in his views, than Kālidāsa

Bhavabhūti has dealt with the love[67] of husband and wife in a comprehensive manner and holds fixed views on the matter which he is never tired of repeating —

(1) True love must begin as 'Love at first sight'.

(2) It must not be influenced by estraneous considerations.

(3) It must be reciprocal, and must lead to the union of the hearts

(4) It may be consolidated by conversation, interview and advice of the elders.

(5) The marriage must secure the sanction of the parents and elders.

Bhavabhūti thus believes (in company with the great poets all over) that marriages are made in

---

67 इतरेतरानुरागो दारकर्मणि पराध्यं मङ्गलम् · यस्या मनश्चक्षुषोर्निर्बन्धस्त-
स्यामृद्धि ।(*Mālatī* II 2 15)
पुरश्चक्षूरागस्तदनु मनसोऽनन्यपरता । *Mālatī* VI 15)
व्यतिषजति पदार्थानान्तर कोऽपि हेतु
न खलु बहिरुपाधीन्प्रीतय सश्रयन्ते ।(*Mālatī* I 24, *Uttara*, VI 12)

heaven, and are to be lived on the earth, with the good will of the elders and relatives

He further emphasises that the happiness of a married couple is incomplete unless there are children. In memorable words,[68] he says that the child is the knot of happiness that binds down the hearts of husband and wife. In drawing the character of Sītā as an ideal woman, Bhavabhūti shows how an ideal wife completely subordinates herself to the will of her husband even in the most adverse circumstances Milton also in *Paradise Lost* (Book IV) makes Eve say to Adam—

'God is thy law, thou mine; to know no more
Is woman's happiest knowledge and her praise'

and glorifies wedded love as

'Hail wedded love, mysterious law, true source
Of human offspring, sole propriety
In Paradise of all things common else.'

Bhavabhūti points out that reverence to the elders and the honour of the family, should be always kept in mind in any walk of life Cast in a Puritan mould that he was, Bhavabhūti enjoins on all that the daily duties prescribed by the Śāstras should be performed without question, and holds similar views on the duties and feelings of women and wives to those propounded by the Puritan poet Milton The following passage from *Paradise Lost* (Book IV) would sound perfectly well in the mouth of Sītā as depicted by Bhavabhūti—

'But neither breath of Morn, when she ascends
With charm of earliest birds, nor rising Sun
On this delightful land; nor herb, fruit, flower,

---

68. अन्तःकरणतत्त्वस्य दम्पत्योः स्नेहसंश्रयात् ।
आनन्दग्रन्थिरेकोऽयमपत्यमिति बध्यते ॥ (*Uttara* III 18)

Glistening with dew, nor fragrance after showers;
Nor grateful Evening mild, nor silent Night
With this her solemn bird, nor walk by moon,
Or glitterning star-light, without thee is sweet.'

Mālatī says (Act II) that she regards her duty to her parents as the foremost to require her attention. Bhavabhūti, no doubt, believes that the solidarity of the family is the most essential thing to be guarded by all at all costs Even the ascetic lady Kāmandakī exerts her utmost towards this end.

In a well-known verse,[69] Bhavabhūti, perhaps drawing upon his personal experience, describes how ideal relations could be established between the parents of the bride and the bride-groom

Sanskrit poets are usually charged by modern critics with displaying a very narrow out-look and harping upon the same worn out topics, and showing no concern for the great injustice to the common man at the hands of the privileged classes. Such a criticism can be levelled against almost all the old Classical writers, both Eastern and Western. It must not be forgotten that one can not dictate to any one what ideology he should follow. A poet is bound to be influenced by the times in which he lives and he is within his rights to select what particular aspect of society strikes him most Rightly or wrongly, the old poets stood by the Patriarchal form of society and tried their utmost to see that it contributed to the well-being of the society as a whole. They do not refer to the miseries of the Plebians prominently, or have no suggestions to make for the material prosperity of the masses, but their answer probably would be that

---

69 कन्यायां किल पूजयन्ति (*Uttara* IV. 17)

these were matters mainly for the King and his officers to consider, and that their chief concern was with 'moral armament'. Besides, a conventional Sanskrit drama gives hardly any scope for a discussion of such matters.

Bhavabhūti has succeeded in placing before his readers a faithful and complete picture of a happy family living harmoniously, and equally capable of resisting adverse Fate, fortified by an undying faith in true love. And the poet has done this in poetic language of a high order According to Sanskrit critics, Bhavabhūti writes in the Gaudī style which allows the use of long compounds adding to the dignity of a passage, while the Vaidarbhī style (of which Kālidāsa is the chief exponent) advocates the use of simple and easy expressions It would be seen from a careful scrutiny of Bhavabhūti's works that Bhavabhūti has successfully used both the Vaidarbhī and Gaudī[70] styles (a mixture of these two is sometimes called Pāñcālī) and has displayed a remarkable judgement in using appropriate metres in describing the various sentiments. Thus while describing the Vīra or Bhayānaka or Bībhatsa sentiment, he writes in the Gaudī style, but the Vaidarbhī style is rightly resorted to in the description of the Sṛngāra (especially love-in-separation) and the Karuna sentiments It is needless to point out such passages; the reader can easily spot them out, many of them can rival the best poetic passages found in Kālidāsa's

70. Vaidarbhi— peculiar to the writers in the Vidarbha territory, Gaudi is specially favoured by the writers in the Gauda territory. Pāñcālī— शब्दार्थयोः समो गुम्फ पाञ्चाली रीतिरिष्यते where word and sense are properly harmonised.

works (Appendix I gives a large number of proverbial passages from Bhavabhūti's works, which would testify to the above remark)

Bhavabhūti gives evidence of his love for nature in all its aspects. The description of the Dandakāranya, and the beasts, rivers, etc., therein shows a very close and sympathetic observation of that region on the part of the poet (See for instance, the description of the holy confluences of the Godāvarī, एते ते कुहरेषु पुण्या सरित्सगमा *Uttara* II, or that of the bears दधति कुहरभाजा etc.) The appeal of the softer beauties of nature is exquisitely described in the briefest possible manner in *Uttara* II, where Rāma says- त्वया सह निवत्स्यामि वनेषु मधुगन्धिषु। इतीहारमते चासौ स्नेहस्तस्याश्च तादृश। and so forth The dictum-Sound must echo to the sense is assiduously respected in the description of the ghosts in the cemetery, and the activities of the Kāpālikas in *Mālatī* V.

That Bhavabhūti has not succeeded as much as he claims as a dramatist, may be granted, but it is evident that he gives ample proof that he can evolve dramatic situations which are described in highly poetic language. Bhavabhūti is very proud of his birth and learning, too much conscious of his poetic powers, and ready to assert himself, and he has left a permanent impression upon Indian culture as a whole, by his delineation of family life and religious fervour, which alone can ensure the right kind of progress and uplift of society as a whole

If Kālidāsa is called the Shakespeare (or Goethe) of India, Bhavabhūti can with greater justification, be called the Milton of India asserting eternal Providence and justifying the ways of God to men.

———————

APPENDIX I

Well-known and Proverbial Passages in The Dramas of Bhavabhūti *

(१) अकिञ्चिदपि कुर्वाण सौख्यैर्दु खान्यपोहति ।
तत्तस्य किमपि द्रव्य यो हि यस्य प्रियो जन ॥
(Uttara VI 5)

Without doing anything at all, he brushes aside griefs by pleasures-a person who is beloved of someone is his inestimable (*kimapi*) treasure !

(२) अग्निरिति वत्सा प्रति परिलघून्यक्षराणि । सीतेत्येव पर्याप्तम् ।
(Uttara IV. 10 11-12

(Purified by) Agni- (these) letters (are) extremely insignificant as referring to the dear one Just Sītā (is more than) sufficient

(३) अचिन्तनीयार्थास्तपसा विशेषा । (Mahā V 39 6)

The excellences of austerities are incomprehensible

(४) अथेद रक्षोभि कनकहरिणच्छद्मविधिना
तथा वृत्त पापैर्व्यथयति यथा क्षालितमपि ।
जनस्थाने शून्ये विकलकरणैरार्यचरितै-
रपि ग्रावा रोदित्यपि दलति वज्रस्य हृदयम् ॥
(Uttara I. 28)

And here was perpetrated (something dastardly) in that manner by the sinful demons, by resorting to the fraud about the golden deer, which, even though avenged (still) pains (us), in the desolate Janasthāna, by the doings of the Noble one, with (his) senses

---

* The passages are arranged alphabetically. References are to the editions of *Mālati* and *Uttara* by R D Karmarkar, for *Mahāvira* the Nirnayasagara edition should be consulted

rendered powerless, even the the stone wept and the heart of the thunderbolt snapped away.

(५) अद्वैत सुग्वदु खयोरनुगुण सर्वास्ववस्थासु यद्
विश्रामो हृदयस्य यत्र जरसा यस्मिन्नहार्यो रस ।
कालेनावरणात्ययात् परिणते यत्स्नेहसारे म्थित
भद्र तस्य सुमानुपस्य कथमप्येक हि तत् प्राप्यते ॥

(Uttara I 39)

What persevering in all states (is) the same (unchangeable) in happiness and grief, where (is ensured) the repose of the heart, in which the (real) flavour cannot be taken away by old age, (and) which culminates in perfect quintessence of affection, on the falling of the veil (of reserve) in course of time—that one auspicious thing (Love) is somehow or other secured by some (lucky) good man !

(६) अनियतरुदितस्मित विराजत्-
कतिपयकोमलदन्तकुड्मलाग्रम् ।
वदनकमलक शिशो स्मरामि
स्खलदसमञ्जसमञ्जु जल्पित ते ॥

(Uttara IV. 4)

I (very well) remember the tiny lotus-like face of you, (when) a child, with its unregulated weepings and smiles, with shining delicate ends of a few bud-like teeth, (and) with (its) faltering, nonsensical and sweet prattle !

(७) अनिर्भिन्नो गभीरत्वादन्तर्गूढधनव्यथ ।
पुटपाकप्रतीकाशो रामस्य करुणो रस ॥

(Uttara III I)

The pathetic sentiment of Rāma not being laid bare, owing to the grave nature (of Rāma), with the deep agony concealed within, resembles the sealed vessel containing medicinal ingredients undergoing the heating process.

(८) अन्त करणतत्त्वस्य दम्पत्यो स्नेहसश्रयात् ।
आनन्दग्रन्थिरेकोऽयमपत्यमिति बध्यते ॥

(Uttara III 17)

The offspıing (ıs) the one knot of blıss tied (made fiım), of the heart-essence of the husband and wıfe, owıng to ıts being the resoıt of affectıon.

(९) अन्धतामिस्रा ह्यसूर्या नाम ते लोकास्तेभ्य प्रतिविधीयन्ते य आत्मघातिन इत्येवमृषयो मन्यन्ते ।

(Uttara IV 3. 3-4)

Those woıds, by name Asūrya, full of pitchy daıkness are, to be sure, assıgned to those who commıt suıcıde— so the sages opıne.

(१०) अन्येषु जन्तुषु रजस्तमसावृतेषु
विश्वस्य धातरि सम परमेश्वरेऽपि ।
सोऽय प्रसिद्धविभव खलु चित्तजन्मा

(Mālatī 1. 20)

Thıs (ıs) indeed that mınd-born one (Madana) of well-known power, ımpartıal to (ı e. affectıng equally) ordınary cıeatures overcome by (the qualıtıes) Rajas and Tamas, the Cıeator of the unıve-ıse, and even the Hıghest Loıd.

(११) अन्योन्यमाहात्म्यविदोऽन्यैरविदितात्मनो ।
विभ्राजते विरोधोऽपि नाम स्नेहे तु का कथा ॥

(Mahā IV 34)

Indeed even the opposıtion of those havıng a comprehensıon of the greatness of each other, whose true selves are not known by others, shınes forth; then what talk of theır affectıon (for each other) !

(१२) अपत्ये यत् तादृग्दुरितमभवत् तेन महता
विषक्तस्तीव्रेण व्रणितहृदयेन व्यथयता ।
पटुर्धारावाही नव इव चिरेणापि हि न मे ।
निकृन्तन्मर्माणि क्रकच इव मन्युर्विरमति ॥

(Uttara IV. 3)

That soit of (astounding) evil which befell (my) child— my wrath implanted firmly by that great, poignant, agonising, heart-wounding (evil) does not, even now after a long time, gnawing at the vitals like a saw, stop, flowing in a stream, and intense, as though (getting a) fresh (lease of life)

(१३) अपि चिन्तामणिश्चिन्तापरिश्रममपेक्षते ।

(Mālatī X 22)

Even the wish-fulfilling gem stands in need of the exertion of wishing (by a person who wants something, before it can grant his desire).

(१४) अमोघमस्त्र क्षत्रस्य ब्राह्मणानामनुग्रह ।
दुरासद च तत्तेज क्षत्र यद्ब्रह्मसयुतम् ॥

(Mahā II 5)

Unfailing is the weapon of the Ksatriyas, (so is) the favour of the Brāhmanas, and that power of the Ksatriyas is invincible, which is joined with the power of the Brāhmanas.

(१५) . अम्बुनि मज्जन्त्यलाबूनि ग्रावाण प्लवन्ते

(Mahā I 39 3)

The gourds sink into water; the stones float.

(१६) असाध्यमन्यथा दोष परिच्छिद्य शरीरिण ।
यथा वैद्यस्तथा राजा शस्त्रपाणिर्भविष्यति ॥

(Mahā IV 23)

A king would have to resort to a weapon, like a physician after having diagnosed the disease of a person incurable otherwise.

(१७) अहेतु पक्षपातो यस्तस्य नास्ति प्रतिक्रिया ।
स हि स्नेहात्मकस्तन्तुरन्तर्मर्माणि सीव्यति ॥

(Uttara V. 17)

What (is) causeless love (lit, partiality, leaning to one side), there is no counter-action for it, for, that thread constituted of love sews the inner vitals.

(१८) अहो आश्चर्यम् ! पुनरुक्तदारुणस्य परिणामरमणीयत्वं विधेः ।
(Mālatī X 19 2)

Oh, wonder ! the charming nature in the end, of Fate, (though) repeatedly cruel !

(१९) अहो सरसरमणीयता संविधानस्य ।
(Mālatī VI 13. 3–4)

Oh, the charming nature, full of sentiments, of the turn of events !

(२०) आविर्भूतज्योतिषां ब्राह्मणानां
ये व्याहारास्तेषु मा संशयोऽभूत् ।
भद्रा ह्येषां वाचि लक्ष्मीर्निषिक्ता
नैते वाचं विप्लुतार्थां वदन्ति ॥
(Uttara IV 18)

Let there be no misgiving (or, doubt) regarding utterances of Brāhmanas on whom Light has flashed forth For, in the words of these is firmly fixed auspicious Glory These do not utter words with their meaning vitiated

(२१) आश्चर्यम् । जयन्ति महतां संस्तुतापलापिन्यः कल्याणिन्यो नीतयः ।
(Mālatī X 23 30)

Wonder ! Victorious are the stratagems of the great, concealing the thing aimed at, (but) proving auspicious (or, beneficial in the end) !

(२२) इतरेतरानुरागो हि दारकर्मणि पराध्यं मङ्गलम् । गीतश्चायमर्थोऽङ्गिरसा यस्यां मनश्चक्षुषोर्निबन्धस्तस्यामृद्धिरिति ।
(Mālatī II. 2. 15–17)

For, mutual affection (is) the most eminent blessing in a matrimonial relation; this point again is sung by Angiras— prosperity abides in her with respect to whom (there is) the attachment of mind and eye (of the bride-groom).

(२३) इयं गेहे लक्ष्मीरियममृतवर्तिर्नयनयो-
रसावस्याः स्पर्शो वपुषि बहुलश्चन्दनरसः ।

अय कण्ठे बाहु शिशिरमसृणो मौक्तिकसर
किमस्या न प्रेयो यदि परमसह्यस्तु विरह ॥

(Uttara I 38)

This one (is) the Lakṣmī (Goddess of auspiciousness) at (my) house, this one (is) the nectar-salve to (my) eyes, this her touch (is) the thick sandal-paste on the body, this (her) arm round (my) neck (is) a necklace of pearls, cool and agreeable, what of her is not even the most agreeable ? If— but (absolutely) unbearable (is) the separation (from her) !

(२४) उत्पत्तिपरिपूताया किमस्या पावनान्तरै ।
तीर्थोदक च वन्हिश्च नान्यथ शुद्धिमर्हत ॥

(Uttara I 13)

· एष ते जीवितावधि प्रवाद ।

(Uttara I. 13 1)

What (use) of other purifying objects for her (who is) sanctified all round (*pari*) from (her very) birth ? Water at holy places and Fire need (lit· deserve) purification from none else

... This scandal (would be) lasting till the end of your life.

(२५) उपायाना भावादविरतविनोदव्यतिकरै-
र्विमर्दैर्वीराणा जगति जनितात्यद्भुतरस ।
वियोगो मुग्धाक्ष्या स खलु रिपुघातावधिरभूत्
कथ तूष्णी सह्यो निरवधिरय त्वप्रतिविध ॥

(Uttara III 44)

That separation from the beautiful-eyed one had indeed its limit upto the destruction of the enemy, (the separation) which, owing to the existence of remedies (to counteract it), created in the world the sentiment of great wonder, owing to the exploits (or, clashes) of heroes, characterised by continuous and diverting

episodes; but how again is this limitless and remedy-less (separation) to be endured silently ?

(२६) ऋषयो राक्षसीमाहुर्वाचमुन्मत्तदृप्तयो ।
सा योनिः सर्ववैराणा सा हि लोकस्य निर्ऋति ॥
(Uttara V. 30)

Sages speak of the speech of the intoxicated and the haughty as demoniacal That (is) the source of all enmities; that again (is) the perdition of the people (or, the world).

(२७) एको रस करुण एव निमित्तभेदाद्
भिन्नः पृथक् पृथगिवाश्रयते विवर्तान् ।
आवर्तबुद्बुदतरङगमयान् विकारा-
नम्भो यथा सलिलमेव हि तत् समस्तम् ॥
(Uttara III 47)

Only one sentiment— Pathos— differentiated owing to attendant causes, resorts, as it were, to various transformations separately, as water (resorts to) the changing forms (such as), whirlpools, waves and ripples, but all that is nothing but water

(२८) एते हि हृदयमर्मच्छिदः ससारभावा येभ्यो बीभत्समाना सत्यज्य सर्वान् कामानरण्ये मनीषिणो विश्राम्यन्ति ।
(Uttara I. 8. 4 5)

These happenings in worldly life, indeed, pierce the vitals of the heart, being disgusted with which, the wise (or spirited), having forsaken all desires, take rest in the forest.

(२९) एवमेव प्रत्यक्षसौख्यदायिनः परोक्षदु खदु सहा सज्जनसमागमा भवन्ति ।
(Mālatī II. 1. 7)

Even thus are the associations with the good, pleasure–giving in (their) presence, (but) quite unbearable through affliction in (their) absence

(३०) कल्याणान्तरावतसा हि कल्याणसपदुपरिष्टाद्भवति ।

(Mālatī VI. 19 2)

One auspıcious blessıng becomes later on decorated by another auspıcıous gaın (i e blessıngs never come alone)

(३१) कामान् दुग्धे विप्रकर्षत्यलक्ष्मी
कीर्ति सूते दुष्कृत या हिनस्ति ।
ता चाप्येता मातर मङ्गलाना
घेनु धीरा सूनृता वाचमाहु ॥

(Uttara V. 31)

The wıse call the truthful speech a cow, whıch yields (all) desıres, drives away at a dıstance mıseıy, produces fame (and) destroys sın, and thıs one too as the mother of all auspıcıousness

(३२) कि त्वनुष्टानर्नित्यत्व स्वातन्त्र्यमपकर्षति ।
सकटा ह्याहिताग्निना प्रत्यवार्यैगृंहस्यता ॥

(Uttara I- 8, Mahā IV. 33)

But ındeed the compulsory performance of prescrıbed rıtes takes away one's ındependence The performance (of the dutıes) of a householder by persons who have kındled (kept) the sacred fires, ıs best wıth obstacles.

(३३) किमपि किमपि मन्द मन्दमासक्तियोगा-
दविरलितकपोल जल्पतोरक्रमेण ।
अशिथिलपरिरम्भव्यापृतैकैकदोष्णो-
रविदितगतयामा रात्रिरेव व्यरसीत् ॥

(Uttara I. 27)

For us two prattling about somethıng or other wıthout any coherence (or, sequence), whıspering and whıspering (or, slowly) wıth our cheeks close owing to deep attachment (and) with each of our arms locked up in a close embrace- the very night wıth (ıts) quarters unnotıced, came to an end (but not our talk).

(३४) कुतो वा महोदधिं वर्जयित्वा पारिजातस्योद्गमः ।

(Mālatī II. 11. 5)

Whence can there be the origin of the Pārijāta, barring the great ocean ?

(३५) 'कुसुमसधर्माणो हि योषितः सुकुमारोपक्रमाः । तास्त्वनधिगतविश्वासैः प्रसभमुपक्रम्यमाणाः सद्यः सम्प्रयोगविद्वेषिण्यो भवन्ति ।' एवं किल कामसूत्रकारा आमनन्ति ।

(Mālatī VII 0. 58-60)

"Women, possessing characteristics equalling those of flowers, should be proceeded with delicately. But, being approached by force by (lovers) who have not secured (their) confidence, they straightaway become averse to (or come to hate) union "— so indeed lay down the compilers of Kāmasūtra (aphorisms on love)

(३६) को नाम पाकाभिमुखस्य जन्तो-
द्वाराणि दैवस्य पिधातुमिष्टे ॥

(Uttara VII. 4; Mālatī X 13)

Who indeed has the power to close the doors of the fate of a creature, ready to ripen up (i. e to produce its effect) !

(३७) कोऽयमग्निर्नामास्मत्प्रसूतिपरिशोधने ? कष्टम्, एववादिना जनेन राम-परिभूता अपि वयं पुनः परिभूयामहे ।

(Uttara IV. 10 9-10)

Who the hell *(nāma)* this Fire for purifying our progeny ? Oh pity, by people talking thus, are we again insulted, although (already) insulted by Rāma.

(३८) गुणाः पूजास्थानं गुणिषु न च लिङ्गं न च वयः ॥

(Uttara IV. 11)

Merits in the meritorious (are) the object of worship, and neither sex, nor age.

(३९) गुरुभिरेव शिशवो धर्मलोपात्पालयितव्याः ।

(Mahā IV 57. 1)

The young ones should be guaıded against the vıolatıon of (the path of) Dharma by the elderly people alone

(४०) गृहे गृहे पुरुषा कुलकन्यका समद्वहन्ति। न खलु कोऽपि लज्जापराधीनमनपराद्ध मुग्धसुकुमारस्वभाव कुलकुमारीजन प्रभवामीति वाचानलेन प्रज्वालयति। एते खलु ते हृदयशल्यनिक्षेपा आमरण सस्मर्यमाणदु सहा पतिगृहनिवासवैराग्यकारिणो महापरिभवा येषा कृते स्त्रीजन्मलाभ जुगुप्सन्ते बान्धवा ।

(Mālatī VII 0 68–72)

In every household men marry maıdens of noble bırth; but no one, ındeed, burns up, sımply because he can lord ıt over, with the fire of speech, a nobly-born maiden, sımple and tender by nature, unoffending and gone under the power of bashfulness These ındeed are the great ındıgnıtıes, the daıt-throws foı the heart, that cause aveısıon to ıesıdence at the husband's house, that aıe unbeaıable rıght up to death, (even) when beıng remembeıed, on account of whıch, relatıves consıder the bırth of a gırl as unwelcome (or hateful

(४१) घोर लोके विततमयशो या च वह्नौ विशुद्धि-
लँङ्काद्वीपे कथमिव जनस्तामिह श्रद्दधातु ।
इक्ष्वाकूणा कुलधनमिद यत् समाराधनीय
कृत्स्नो लोकस्तदिति विषमे कि स वत्स करोतु ।।

(Uttara VII 6)

The terrible ınfamy had spread over among the people As for the puııficatıon by fire ın the ısland of Lankā, how possıbly could the publıc here belıeve in it ? This (ıs) the famıly-treasure of the scıons of Iksvāku,— that the entıre people are to be propıtıated So, in such a catastrophe, what could that chıld do ?

(४२) चिर ध्यात्वा ध्यात्वा निहित इव निर्माय पुरत
प्रवासेऽप्याश्वास न खलु न करोति प्रियजन ।
जगज्जीर्णारण्य भवति च कलत्रव्युपरमे
कुकूलाना राशौ तदनु हृदय पच्यत इव ।।

(Uttara VI 38)

Not indeed that a dear person does not give comfort even when away, as though placed in front after having been created by repeatedly revolving upon (the person in the mind) for a long time ! On the wife ceasing to exist, the world becomes a desolate forest, and thereafter, the heart is as if cooked up on a heap of (masses of) chaff.

(४३) जगति जयिनस्ते ते भावा नवेन्दुकलादय
प्रकृतिमधुरा सन्त्येवान्ये मनो मदयन्ति ये ।

(Mālatī I. 36)

There are indeed other various objects in (this) world, victorious and naturally agreeable, the digit of the new moon and others, that enthrall the mind.

(४४) जनकाना रघूणा च यत्कृत्स्न गोत्रमङगलम् ।
या देवयजने पुण्ये पुण्यशीलामजीजन ॥

(Uttara I 51)

Who (is) the entire auspciousness of the race of the Janakas and the Raghus, and whom the meritorious one, you begot on the holy sacrificial ground of the gods

(४५) जीवत्सु तातपादेषु नवे दारपरिग्रहे ।
मातृभिश्चिन्त्यमानानां ते हि नो दिवसा गता ॥

(Uttara I. 19)

With (our revered father living, with marriage newly contracted, gone, verily, are those days of us being looked after by (our) mothers.

(४६) तद्वत्स, वाक्प्रतिष्ठानि देहिना व्यवहारतन्त्राणि । वाचि पुण्यापुण्यहेतवं व्यवस्थाः सर्वथा जनानामायतन्ते ।

(Mālati IV. 4. 13-14)

Now, child, the transactions of worldly life of human beings are based upon speech; the activities of (all) men, leading to merit or demerit are entirely centred in speech.

(४७) तमासि ध्वसन्ते परिणमति भूयानुपशम:
सकृत्सवादेऽपि प्रथत इह चामुत्र च शुभम् ।
अथ प्रत्यासङ्ग: कमपि महिमान वितरति
प्रसन्नाना वाच' फलमपरिमेय प्रसुवते ॥

(Mahā I 12)

(By the company of great sages)— perishes darkness (ignorance); in a large measure tranquility results One talk even with them leads to blessings here and hereafter (Their) association further spreads over indescribable greatness, (and) the words of those who are pleased, result in unlimited bounties.

(४८) त्रातु लोकानिव परिणत कायवानस्त्रवेद:
क्षात्रो धर्म श्रित इव तनु ब्रह्मकोषस्य गुप्त्यै ।
सामर्थ्यानामिव समुदय' सचयो वा गुणाना-
माविर्भूय स्थित इव जगत्पुण्यनिर्माणराशि: ॥

(Uttara VI 9, Mahā II. 41)

(Candraketu is) as though the Science of missiles, transformed into one possessed of a body to protect the worlds, as though the Ksatriya Duty resorting to a body for the protection of the treasure of the Vedas, as though a collective rise of powers, as though a heap of good qualities, as though a store of the holy creations in the world standing up, having become visible

(४९) त्व जीवित त्वमसि मे हृदय द्वितीय
त्व कौमुदि नयनयोरमृत त्वमङ्गे ।
इत्यादिभि प्रियशतैरनुरुध्य मुग्धा
तामेव शान्तमथवा किमिहोत्तरेण ॥

(Uttara III. 27)

You (are my) life ! You are my second heart ! You are moon-light to (my) eyes ! Nectar to (my) limbs ! — Having coaxed up the simple-hearted

(one) with such other hundreds of agreeable words, the same one — Or peace! What (use) of (referring to) the sequel in this case?

(५०) त्वया जगन्ति पुण्यानि त्वय्यपुण्या जनोक्तयः ।
नाथवन्तस्त्वया लोकास्त्वमनाथा विपत्स्यसे ॥

(Uttara I. 43)

By you (are) the worlds holy; (but) the talks of the people (are) unholy in respect of you. The worlds (are) possessed of a protector in you, (but) you are going to naught, protectorless.

(५१) ददतु तरवः पुष्पैरर्घ्यं फलैश्च मधुश्च्युत
स्फुटितकमलामोदप्रायाः प्रवान्तु वनानिलाः ।
कलमविरल रज्यत्कण्ठा क्वणन्तु शकुन्तयः
पुनरिदमय देवो रामः स्वय वनमागतः ॥

(Uttara III. 25)

Let the trees, dripping out honey, offer the worship-offering, with flowers and fruit; let the sylvan breezes, mostly laden with the perfume of lotuses opened out, blow, let the birds with throats full of passion, produce sweet notes continuously, His Majesty Rāma here, has again come to this forest of his own accord!

(५२) दुग्धार्णवादृते जन्म चन्द्रकौस्तुभयोः कुतः ।

(Mahā I. 23)

Whence can be the origin of the Moon and the Kaustubha gem but from the milk-ocean?

(५३) दृष्टिस्तृणीकृतजगत्त्रयसत्त्वसारा
धीरोद्धता नमयतीव गतिर्धरित्रीम् ।
कौमारकेऽपि गिरिवद्गुरुता दधानो
वीरो रस किमयमेत्युत दर्प एव ॥

(Uttara VI. 19)

(His) sight treats, as if it were grass, (i. e with contempt) the essence of the might of the three worlds. (His) gait, firm and haughty, is as though bending the

earth down. Bearing dignity, like a mountain, even though in boyhood, is it the Heroic sentiment or Pride itself that is coming up here?

(५४) धिगहो वीरव्रतक्रूरताम् ।

(Mahā II. 32)

Fie upon the cruelty of those wedded to heroism!

(५५) न खलु स उपरतो यस्य वल्लभो जन स्मरति ।

(Mālatī V. 24. 3–4)

Not indeed is he dead whom (his) beloved person remembers.

(५६) न तेजस्तेजस्वी प्रसृतमपरेषा प्रसहते
स तस्य स्वो भाव प्रकृतिनियतत्वादकृतकः ।
मयूखैरश्रान्त तपति यदि देवो दिनकर
किमाग्नेयग्रावा निकृत इव तेजासि वमति ॥

(Uttara VI. 14)

A spirited person does not tolerate the over-spreading spirit of others; that (is) his own character determined by (his) own nature, (and) not artificial. When the God Sun heats up, without rest, by (his) rays, why does the fire-stone emit flames as though insulted?

(५७) नैसर्गिकी सुरभिणः कुसुमस्य सिद्धा
मूर्ध्नि स्थितिर्न चरणैरवताडनानि ॥

(Uttara I 14; Mālatī IX 50)

The natural position of a fragrant flower is evidently (or, proved to be) on the head, not tramplings by the feet.

(५८) नोत्सवा परावधीरणावैरस्यमर्हन्ति ।

(Mahā II. 18 3)

Festive occasions should not be marred (impaired) by insult to others.

(५९) नृशसता हि नाम पुरुषदोष. ।

(Mahā II. 48 1)

Cruelty is indeed the blemish of man.

(६०) पुरन्ध्रीणा चित्त कुसुमसुकुमार हि भवति ॥

(Uttara IV 12)

For, the mind of house-wives is delicate like a flower

(६१) पूरोत्पीडे तडागस्य परीवाह प्रतिक्रिया ।
शोकक्षोभे च हृदय प्रलापैरेव धार्यते ॥

(Uttara III 30)

When (there is) the over-flooding of a tank, overflow (of the water is the only) counter-remedy, when (there is) the turmoil due to grief, the heart is sustained by loud lamentations alone

(६२) प्रभवति पुनर्दैवमपरम् ।

(Mālatī IV 6)

But another (factor) Fate also prevails

(६३) प्रभवति प्राय कुमारीणा जनयिता दैव च ।

(Mālatī II 7. 12)

Generally, the father and Fate have command over daughters (or maidens).

(६४) प्रसव खलु प्रकर्षपर्यन्त स्नेहस्य । पर चैतदन्योन्यसश्लेषण पित्रो ।

(Uttara III 17. 20–21)

A child, indeed, is the *ne plus ultra* of affection, and it is the highest mutual attraction-factor for the parents.

(६५) प्राकृतानि तेजास्यप्राकृते ज्योतिषि शाम्यन्ति ।

(Mahā III. 18. 3)

Ordinary lustres get merged in the extraordinary lustrous one.

(६६) प्राय शुभ च विदधात्यशुभ च जन्तो
सर्वकषा भगवती भवितव्यतैव ॥

(Mālatī I. 23)

Generally the all-embracing divine Fate itself dispenses welfare as well as evil for cieatuies,

(६७) प्रायेण बान्धवसुहृत्प्रियसगमादि
सौदामिनीस्फुरणचञ्चलमेव सौख्यम् ॥

(Mālatī VIII. 14)

Generally, happiness, such as the union of relatives, friends and those who aie dear to (us) (is), verily, as fleeting as the lightning-flash

(६८) प्रियप्राया वृत्तिर्विनयमसृणो वाचि नियम
प्रकृत्य कल्याणी मतिरनवगीत परिचय ।
पुरो वा पश्चाद्वा तदिदमविपर्यासितरम
रहस्य साधूनामनुपधि विशुद्ध विजयते ॥

(Uttara II 2)

Behaviour mostly agreeable, restraint in speech soft with discipline, temper benevolent by natuie, familiarity irreproachable—this secret (code of conduct) of the good, with (its) flavour unchanged either before or aftei, without limitation, absolutely pure (is always) triumphant !

(६९) प्रियानाशे कृत्स्न किल जगदरण्य हि भवति ।

(Uttara VI. 30)

For, with the loss of the beloved, the world, verily, becomes a forest.

(७०) प्रेयो मित्र बन्धुता वा समग्रा
सर्वे कामा शेवधिर्जीवित वा ।
स्त्रीणा भर्ता धर्मदाराश्च पुसा-
मित्यन्योन्य वत्सयोर्ज्ञातमस्तु ॥

(Mālatī VI 18)

The husband to women, and the lawfully wedded wife to men, are the dearest friends, all relatives put together, all desires, a treasure or the (ife (itself)— let this be mutually boine in mind by lmy two) dear ones !

(७१) बहि सर्वाकारप्रवणरमणीय व्यवहरन्-
पराभ्यूहस्थानान्यपि तनुतराणि स्थगयति ।
जन विद्वानेक सकलमतिसधाय कपटै-
स्तटस्थ स्वानर्थान्घटयति च मौन च भजते ॥

(Mālatī I 14)

A clever man (though) alone, acting outwardly in a charming manner in respect of form and gestures, conceals (or covers up) even the minutest points furnishing (a clue for) guessing by others, and remaining indifferent, over-reaching everything by wiles, accomplishes his desired objects and at the same ime keeps silent.

(७२) भूयसा जीविधर्म एष, यद्रसमयी कस्यचित् क्वचित् प्रीति, यत्र लौकिकानामुपचारस्तारामैत्रक चक्षूराग इति। तमप्रतिसख्येयमनिबन्धनप्रेमाणमामनन्ति ।

(Mālatī V 16. 1)

Mostly this (is) the nature of living beings that there (is) affection full of (deep) sentiment, of some one somewhere, for which there is the popular mode of description, viz the friendship due to the stars, the love of the eye (at first sight). They (the sages) declare it to be inexpressible (and) causeless love.

(७३) भ्रमति भुवने कन्दर्पाज्ञा विकारि च यौवन
ललितमधुरास्ने ते भावा क्षिपन्ति च धीरताम् ॥

(Mālatī I. 17)

The command of Madana struts about in the universe, and youth (is) impressionable and the various charming and sweet objects disturb the placidity (of mind).

(७४) मनोरथस्य यद्बीज तद्दैवेनादितो हृतम् ।
लताया पूर्वलूनाया प्रसूनस्यागम कुत. ॥

(Uttara V. 20)

What (was) the seed (or, basis) of desire, that has been carried off by Fate right from the start ! When the creeper has been already (*pūrva*) cut off, whence (can there be) the coming out of flowers ?

(७५) मरणमपि मन्दभागधेयानामभिमतमिति दुर्लभ भवति ।

(Mālatī VI 7 3-4)

Even death becomes difficult to secure, (simply) because it is coveted by the luckless !

(७६) म्लानस्य जीवकुसुमस्य विकासनानि
सतर्पणानि सकलेन्द्रियमोहनानि ।
एतानि ते सुवचनानि सरोरुहाक्षि
कर्णामृतानि मनसश्च रसायनानि ॥

(Uttara I 36)

These sweet words of yours, O lotus-eyed one ! the cause for blossoming the faded life-flower, delight producing, infatuating all the sense-organs (are) nectar to the ears and elixir to the mind

(७७) यदृत्त्छासवाद किमु किमु गुणानामतिशय
पुराणो वा जन्मान्तरनिबिडबद्ध परिचय ।
निजो वा सबन्ध किमु विधिवशात् कोऽप्यविदितो
ममैतस्मिन् दृष्टे हृदयमवधान रचयति ॥

(Uttara V 16)

(Is it) possibly the accidental conversation ? (Is it) possibly the excess of good qualities ? Or, (is it) the old acquaintance firmly fixed up in (some) another (earlier) birth ? Or, is it possibly some personal relation, somehow (remained) unknown through the working of Fate ? —When this one is seen, my heart brings about deep attention (to bear on him).

(७८) यद्वेदाध्ययन तथोपनिषदा साख्यस्य योगस्य च
ज्ञान तत्कथनेन कि न हि तत कश्चिद्गुणो नाटके ।
यत्प्रौढत्वमुदारता च वचसा यच्चार्थतो गौरव
तच्चेदस्ति ततस्तदेव गमक पाण्डित्यवैदग्ध्ययो ॥

(Mālatī I. 7)

What is the use of talking about the study of the Vedas, and likewise the knowledge of the Upanisads, the Sāmkhya and the Yoga? For, there arises no merit of any kind from them in a drama. What (is) dignity and felicity of expression and what (is) depth of meaning—if that exists, then that alone is indicative of scholarship and genius.

(७९) यशसि निरवकाशे विश्वत श्वेतमाने
कथमपि वचनीय प्राप्य यत्किचिदेव ।
कृतविततिरकस्मात्प्राकृतैरुत्तमाना
विरमति न कथचित्कश्मला किवदन्ती ॥

(Mahā III 4)

The scandalous rumour about the great spread wide all of a sudden by ordinary persons, after having found something censurable somehow or other, in (their) compact fame, glorious all round does not come to an end in any way

(८०) युक्त प्रजानामनुरञ्जने स्यात्तस्माद्यशो यत् परम घन व ॥

(Uttara I 11)

Be you devotedly engaged in the gratification of the subjects, the reputation (arising) from that (is) your highest wealth (or, treasure)

(८१) ये नाम केचिदिह न प्रथयन्त्यवज्ञा
जानन्ति ते किमपि तान्प्रति नैष यत्न ।
उत्पत्स्यतेऽस्ति मम कोऽपि समानधर्मा
कालो ह्यय निरवधिर्विपुला च पृथ्वी ॥

(Mālatī I 6)

Those indeed who broad-cast disrespect towards us here (as regards our composition), know they something inconceivable; not for them is (intended) this effort There would arise (or) there is someone or other having similar qualities with me For, time for the matter of that *(ayam)*, (is) endless and the earth huge (or, extensive).

(८२) लौकिकाना हि साधूनामर्थ वागनुवर्तते ।
ऋषीणा पुनराद्याना वाचमर्थोऽनुधावति ॥

(Uttara I 10)

In the case of the ordinary (worldly) sages, the speech follows (i. e is in accordance with) the state of things, (in the case) of the ancient seers, on the other hand, the fact follows the speech.

(८३) वज्रादपि कठोराणि मृदूनि कुसुमादपि ।
लोकोत्तराणा चेतासि को नु विज्ञातुमर्हति ॥

(Uttara II 7)

Who, indeed, deserves to understand (the workings of) the minds of superhuman people, (that are) tougher than even adamant, and softer than even a flower ?

(८४) वितरति गुरु प्राज्ञे विद्या यथैव तथा जडे
न खलु तयोर्ज्ञाने शक्ति करोत्यपहन्ति वा ।
भवति च पुनर्भूयान् भेद फल प्रति तद्यथा
प्रभवति शुचिर्बिम्बोद्ग्राहे मणिर्न मृदा चय ॥

(Uttara II 4)

The teacher imparts instruction to an intelligent (pupil) in the same way as to a dull (pupil), and surely does he not add or substract power, in the matter of their comprehension. But, again, there (arises) great difference as regards the result (of the instruction)— it (is) like this— A clear (or, pure) gem is able to receive reflection, not a heap of earth.

(८५) विषयबाहुल्य कालविप्रकर्षश्च स्मृति प्रमुष्णाति ।

(Mahā V 9 4)

Variety of subjects and the long distance of time rob (one's) memory.

(८६) वीराणा समयो हि दारुणरस स्नेहक्रम बाधते ॥

(Uttara V. 19)

The convention of warriors, full of dreadful sentiment stands opposed to the course (or, scope) of affection.

(८७) वृद्धास्ते न विचारणीयचरितास्तिष्ठन्तु किं वर्ण्यते
सुन्दस्त्रीदमनेऽप्यखण्डयशसो लोके महान्तो हि ते ।
यानि त्रीण्यकुतोभयान्यपि पदान्यासन् खरायोधने
यद्वा कौशलमिन्द्रसूनुनिधने तत्राप्यभिज्ञो जन

('Uttara V. 35)

Aged are they, their career ought not to be criticised; let them be left alone Why should there be any description thereof? For they (are acclaimed to be) great in the world, with (their) fame unstinted, even in laying low the wife of Sunda! As for the three steps, although without fear from any quarter, that were (taken backwards) in battle with Khara, or the (remarkable !) skill (shown) in killing the son of Indra—(well !) in respect thereof too, people (are pretty) well acquainted !

(८८) व्यतिषजति पदार्थानान्तर कोऽपि हेतु-
र्न खलु बहिरुपाधीन् प्रीतय सश्रयन्ते ।
विकसति हि पतङ्गस्योदये पुण्डरीक
द्रवति च हिमरश्मावुद्गते चन्द्रकान्त ॥

(Mālatī I 24, Uttara VI 12)

Some indescribable inner cause binds objects together Not indeed do affections resort to external adjuncts. For, the lotus blossoms at the rise of the Sun and the moon-stone oozes when the Moon (the snow-rayed one) rises

(८९) शक्तिर्हि कालस्य विभोर्जराख्या
शक्त्यन्तराणा प्रतिबन्धहेतु ॥

(Mahā V 4)

The power, namely old age, of Time, the Lord, is the cause of obstruction of all other powers.

(९०) शास्त्रे प्रतिष्ठा सहजश्च बोध
प्रागल्भ्यमभ्यस्तगुणा च वाणी ।

कालानुरोध प्रतिभानवत्त्व-
मेते गुणा कामदुधा क्रियासु ॥

(Mālatī III 11)

Proficiency in (or, certain knowledge of) the Śāstras, natural comprehension, boldness, and speech possessing excellence owing to practice, acting in accordance with time, (and) ready wit — these qualities fulfil the desired objects in undertakings

(९१) सकरुणा हि गुरव· गर्भरूपेषु ।

(Uttara VII. 7 1)

Full of mercy (are), indeed, the elders towards the children

(९२) सगम· कर्मणा भेदाद्यदि न स्यान्न नाम स ।
प्राणाना तु परित्यागे सतापोपशम· फलम् ॥

(Mālatī X. 7)

If there be no union (after death) owing to the difference of Karmans, let it indeed not be, on the abandonment of life at any rate *(tu)* (is there the unquestionable) fruit, the cessation of torment.

सता केनापि कार्येण लोकस्याराधन व्रतम् ।
यत् पूरित हि तातेन मा च प्राणाश्च मुञ्चता ॥

(Uttara I 41)

For the good, the propitiation of the people by whatever means (is) a sacred duty, which indeed was fulfilled by (my) father abandoning me as well as (his) life.

(९४) सता सद्भि सङ्ग कथमपि हि पुण्येन भवति ।

(Uttara II 1 B)

The meeting of the good with the good takes place with great difficulty, by (virtue) of (previous) merit

(९५) सन्तानवाहीन्यपि मानुषाणा दुःखानि सद्बन्धुवियोगजानि ।
दृष्टे जने प्रेयसि दुःसहानि स्रोतःसहस्रैरिव सप्लवन्ते ॥

(Uttara IV. 8)

Sorrows of human beings, caused by the separation from good relatives, although continuously flowing

difficult to bear when a dear person is seen, come in flood in thousands of streams as it were !

(९६) सन्तापकारिणो बन्धुजनविप्रयोगा भवन्ति ।

(Uttara I. 8 2-3)

Separations from relatives (do) cause torment.

(९७) सर्वः प्रायो भजति विकृतिं भिद्यमाने प्रतापे ।

(Mahā II. 4)

Every one normally attains to an adverse state when one's valour is thwarted.

(९८) सर्वथा व्यवहर्तव्यं कुतो ह्यवचनीयता ।
यथा स्त्रीणां तथा वाचां साधुत्वे दुर्जनो जनः ॥

(Uttara I. 5)

By all means, one should practise what has to be done; for whence (can there be) the absence of censure ? As in (the case) of purity of women, so of words, people (are) bad people (that is, malicious, accustomed to spread scandal).

(९९) सर्वमतिमात्रं दोषाय ।

(Uttara VI. 5. 7)

Everything carried to excess brings on evil (*doṣa*).

(१००) साक्षात्कृतधर्माण ऋषयः । तेषाममृतभराणि भगवतां परोरजांसि प्रज्ञानानि न क्वचिद् व्याहन्यन्ते, इत्यनभिशङ्कनीयानि ।

(Uttara VII. 1. 12-13)

The Seers are those who have directly perceived the Dharmas. The particular findings (or, knowledges) of those Revered ones, flooded over with nectar, eschewed of (lit. beyond) all *Rajas* (passion, prejudice) propensities, are nowhere stultified, and so cannot be doubted.

(१०१) सिद्धं ह्येतद्वाचि वीर्यं द्विजानां
बाह्वोर्वीर्यं यत् तु तत् क्षत्रियाणाम् ।
शस्त्रग्राही ब्राह्मणो जामदग्न्य-
स्तस्मिन् दान्ते का स्तुतिस्तस्य राज्ञः ॥

(Uttara V. 33)

For, it is (well -) established that the valour of the Brāhmanas (lies) in (their) tongue; what (is) the valour of arms, that, however, belongs to the Kṣatriyas. The son of Jamadagni (was) a Brāhmana taking to arms, what praise (accrues) to that King, when he is vanquished !

(१०२) सुलभानुकार· खलु जगति वेधसो निर्माणसनिवेशः ।

(Mālatī IX. 28 1)

Surely the method (or, arrangement) of creation of the Creator in the world admits of easy imitations.

(१०३) सुहृदिव प्रकटय्य सुखप्रदः प्रथममेकरसामनुकूलताम् ।
पुनरकाण्डविवर्तनदारुणः प्रविशिनष्टि विधिर्मनसो रुजम् ॥

(Uttara IV. 7)

Having first exhibited like a happiness-dispensing friend, favourable disposition all round (*ekarasā*), but becoming terrible by a sudden change of front, Fate aggravates considerably the affliction of the mind

(१०४) स्नेह दया च सौख्य च यदि वा जानकीमपि ।
आराधनाय लोकाना मुञ्चतो नास्ति मे व्यथा ॥

(Uttara I. 12)

There would be no pain for me abandoning for the propitiation of the people, affection and pity and happiness; and for the matter of that, even Jānakī !

(१०५) स्नेहश्च निमित्तसव्यपेक्षश्च, इति विप्रतिषिद्धमेतत् ।

(Uttara VI. 11. 2-3)

(To speak of) affection, and at the same time (to describe it) as dependent on some cause— this (is) contradiction (in terms).

(१०६) हृदय त्वेव जानाति प्रीतियोग परस्परम् ॥

(Uttara VI. 32)

The heart alone knows, however, the mutual love-course.

APPENDIX II

SOME STANZAS ASCRIBED TO BHAVABHŪTI

(From the *Saduktikarṇāmṛta*)

(1) उषसि गुरुनमक्ष [illegible]जनाना मृगाक्षी
रतिरुतमनुकर्तु राजकीरे प्रवृत्ते ।
तिरयति शिशुलीलानर्तनच्छद्मताल–
प्रचलवलयमालास्फालकोलाहलेन ॥

(II. 141 4)

(2) का तपस्वी गतोऽवस्थामिति स्मेराविव स्तनौ ।
वन्दे गौरीघनाश्लेषभवभूतिसिताननौ ॥

(I. 22.4)

(3) गाढग्रन्थिप्रफुल्लद्गलविफणफणापीठनिर्यद्विषाग्नि–
ज्वालानिष्टप्तचन्द्रद्रवदमृतरसप्रोषितप्रेतभावा ।
उज्जृम्भा बभ्रुनेत्रद्युतिमसकृद्दसृक्तृष्णयालोकयन्त्य
पान्तु त्वा नागना. ग्रथितशवशिर श्रेणये भैरवस्य ॥

(I. 13.2)

(4) चूडापीडनिबद्धवासुकिफणाफूत्कारनिर्यद्विष–
ज्वालाजृम्भितमत्स्यकच्छपवधूलीढेन्दुलेखामृतम् ।
अव्याद्व स्मरसूदनस्य मदनक्रीडाकचाकर्षण–
श्च्योतन्नाकसरित्सरोषगिरिजादृष्ट जटामण्डलम् ॥

(I. 12.2)

(5) नि ससार करघातविदीर्णध्वान्तदन्तरुधिरदारुणमूर्ति ।
केसरीव कटकादुदयाद्रेरङ्कलीनहरिणो हरिणाङ्क ॥

(6) भुवा घर्मारम्भे पवनचलित तापहृतये
पटच्छत्राकार वहति गगन धूलिपटलम् ।
अमी मन्दाराणा दवदहनसदेहितधियो
न ढौकन्ते पातु झटिति मकरन्द मधुलिह ॥

(II. 157.1)

(7) लघुनि तृणकुटीरे क्षेत्रकोणे यवाना
नवकमलपलालस्रस्तरे सोपधाने ।
परिहरति सुषुप्त हालिकद्वन्द्वमारात्
म्तनकलशमहोष्माबद्धरेखस्तुषार ॥

(II 173 1)

(8) वैकुण्ठस्य करङ्कमङ्कनिहित स्रष्टु कपाल करे
प्रत्यङ्ग च विभूषण विरचित नाकौकसा कीकसै ।
भस्म स्थावरजङ्गमस्य जगत शुभ्र तनौ बिभ्रत
कल्पान्तेषु कपालिनो विजयते रौद्र कपालव्रतम् ॥

(I 18 3)

(9) शौर्य शत्रुकुलक्षयावधि यशो ब्रह्माण्डखण्डावधि
त्याग सप्तसमुद्रमुद्रितमहीनिर्व्याजदानावधि ।
वीर्यं यत्तु गिरा न तत्पथि ननु व्यक्त हि तत्कर्मभि
सत्य ब्रह्मतपोनिधेर्भगवत कि कि न लोकोत्तरम् ॥

(I. 45 3)

(10) अलिपटलैरनुयाता सहृदयहृदयज्वर विलुम्पन्तीम् ।
मृगमदपरिमललहरी समीर पामरपुरे किरसि ॥

(शाङ्र्गधरपद्धति, 791, also quoted by गदाधरभट्ट in his रसिकजीवन, at III. 22)

(11) दैवाद्यद्यपि तुल्योऽभूद्भूतेशस्य परिग्रह ।
तथापि कि कपालानि तुला यान्ति कलानिधे ॥

(ibid 749)

(12) निरवद्यानि पद्यानि यद्यनाद्यस्य का क्षति ।
भिक्षुकक्षाविनिक्षिप्त किमिक्षुर्नीरसो भवेत् ॥

(ibid 146)

(13) कि चन्द्रमा प्रत्युपकारलिप्सया
करोति गोभि कुमुदावबोधनम् ।
स्वभाव एवोन्नतचेतसा सता
परोपकारव्यसन हि जीवितम् ॥

(रसिकजीवन of गदाधरभट्ट, III. 95)

(14) अनन्तपण्डित while commenting on the stanza 'भवभूते सम्बन्धात् .. " in the आर्यासप्तशती, and गोवर्धनाचार्य cite much the same stanza as सदुक्तिकर्णामृत (I. 22.4);

It reads as follows —

तपस्वी का गतोऽवस्थामिति स्मेराननाविव ।
गिरिजाया स्तनौ वन्दे भवभूतिसिताननौ ।।

(15) In his commentary on the महावीरचरित, वीरराघव (p 8. Nirṇayasāgara Ed. 1910) refers to the following line from a stanza of Bhavabhūti :-

साम्बा पुनातु भवभूतिपवित्रमूर्ति ।

APPENDIX III

(Index of important Names and Topics)

APPENDIX IV

(Verses in appreciation of Bhavabhūti by old Sanskrit writers)

(१) स्पष्टभावरसा चित्रै पादन्यासै प्रवर्तिता ।
नाटकेषु नटस्त्रीव भारती **भवभूतिना** ।। (धनपाल—तिलकमञ्जरी

(२) **भवभूतेः** शिखरिणी निरर्गलतरङ्गिणी ।
रुचिरा घनसन्दर्भे या मयूरीव नृत्यति ।। (क्षेमेन्द्र—सुवृत्ततिलक)

(३) बभूव वल्मीकभव पुरा कविस्तत प्रपेदे भुवि भर्तृमेण्ठताम् ।
स्थित पुनर्यो **भवभूति**रेखया स वर्तते सप्रति राजशेखर ।।
(राजशेखर—बालरामायण

(४) **भवभूतेः** सबन्धाद्भूधरभूरेव भारती भाति ।
एतत्कृतकारुण्ये किमन्यथा रोदिति ग्रावा ।।
(गोवर्धन—आर्यासप्तशती

(५) **भवभूति**मनादृत्य निर्वाणमतिना मया ।
मुरारिपदचिन्तायामिदमाधीयते मन ।। ((quoted in
शाङ्र्गधरपद्धति

(In the *Bhojaprabandha*, the following verse is attributed to Kālidāsa :—
सुकविद्वितय मन्ये निखिलेऽपि महीतले ।
भवभूतिः शुकश्चाय वाल्मीकिस्त्रितयोऽनयो ।।)

— —

ERRATA

Page	Line	For	Read
1	26	· सेविता.	सेवित
20	19	tnaıng	nating
47	21	remieded	reminded
59	26	ean	can
71	21	मुञ्च	मुञ्च
75	8	पिबसि ...	पिबसी ..
86	19	estraneous	extraneous
92	26	.. धनव्यथ	....घनव्यथ
93	2	बध्यते	बध्यते
93	7	आत्मधातिन	आत्मघातिन
93	10	words	worlds
98	15	त्वनुष्टान ..	त्वनुष्ठान...
98	21	best	beset
102	4	प्रमन्नाना	प्रसन्नाना
102	26	कौमुदि	कौमुदी
106	32	(ıfe	life
106	33	lmy	(my
108	18	यदृत्छा	यदृच्छा ...
109	18	स्यात्तस्माद्यशो	स्यात्तस्माद्यशो
109	18	घन	धन
110	16	न खलु	न च खलु
110	18	मणिर्न	मणिर्न
112	2	कामदुधा	कामदुघाः

———